

THE CLERGY REVIEW

THE TREND OF BIBLICAL CRITICISM

BY THE REV. JOHN M. T. BARTON, D.D., Lic.S.Script.

ANYBODY, or almost anybody, who has read the late Lytton Strachey's *Eminent Victorians* will recognize the opening words of the preface which explains the author's approach to his subject. "The history of the Victorian Age will never be written: we know too much about it. For ignorance is the first requisite of the historian—ignorance, which simplifies and clarifies, which selects and omits, with a placid perfection unattainable by the highest art." "One cannot," he continues, "hope to make an adequate survey of the documentary records that have accumulated in such profusion; one can but row out over that great ocean of material and lower down into it, here and there, a little bucket, which will bring up to the light of day some characteristic specimen from those far depths to be examined with a careful curiosity." The application of this principle in Strachey's own works was not, as we know, uniformly happy. Of the four culprits whom he indicts at the bar of his critical powers in *Eminent Victorians*, not one has remained undefended; in one case, at least, the proceedings have ended in a clear acquittal. Strachey's study of Cardinal Manning is, like Purcell's *Life* on which it is largely based, a malignant caricature; his essays on Florence Nightingale and Dr. Arnold of Rugby have not been accepted without demur by those who have reason to be better informed than was Mr. Strachey regarding the character of his victims; his portrayal of the hero of Khartoum has, within the

last five years, been pitilessly exposed by a more careful student of the facts.¹ And one need scarcely press the matter home with regard to the vast assembly of lesser Stracheys who have attempted the same perilous method without many traces of the Stracheyan brilliance in epigram and invective. They have helped to set a fashion in the inadequate and superficial type of biography which is already, one would like to believe, out-moded.

We cannot, however, deny that there are occasions when selection and omission are inevitable and the present occasion is certainly one of these. So I have decided, in lieu of a bare summary of many topics or a lengthy treatment of a single topic, to select two or three problems that may be of interest as illustrations of certain tendencies in modern Biblical criticism. This will involve a reference to some of the books on the subjects mentioned, those, namely, that come within my own limited range of reading. If this gives this paper the character of a *bibliographie raisonnée*, I shall not be too greatly dissatisfied. I have selected the topics on the basis of avoiding concentration on any one area of the biblical field. Thus I have taken one subject from patriarchal history, one from the legal sections of the Pentateuch, and a third from the New Testament.

My first subject for discussion is the historicity of the patriarchal narratives in Genesis, a subject that has been taken up again in recent years, at a time when, outside the Catholic body, it might have seemed that the last word had been uttered. I have argued the point at some length in the essay on "Patriarchal and Mosaic Religion" in the C.T.S. *Studies in Comparative Religion*,² and I shall repeat in some slight measure what I wrote there.

Briefly, until quite recently, it was the opinion of most non-Catholic scholars that the patriarchs of Genesis were legendary figures, names of tribes, lunar heroes or what you will, provided one hypothesis was excluded—

¹ *Gordon and the Sudan*. By Bernard M. Allen. London, 1931.

² No. 17 in the series. London, the Catholic Truth Society, 1934.

that they were genuinely historical characters.³

Recently, however, there has been a considerable reaction against such arbitrary and perverse conclusions. In Holland Dr. Franz Böhl of Leyden in his booklet *Das Zeitalter Abrahams*,⁴ and in Germany Dr. Albrecht Alt, one of the most learned of all Old Testament critics in this or any age, have helped to turn the tide of critical opinion.⁵ Dr. Böhl is able to write that the patriarchal narratives are in essentials historical; that "Just as the Homeric Age stands at the beginning of Greek history, so does the age of the Patriarchs in Israelite history. Through the mist of ages we greet the figure of Abraham, whom Christians, Jews and Mohammedans reverence as 'a friend of God' and as 'the father of all who believe.'"⁶ And Alt, in his turn, is convinced that the patriarchal religion is no invention of a later age but a faithful reflection of pre-Mosaic conditions. "Abraham, Isaac and Jacob," he writes, "remain on the other side of Moses, but the lines which lead from their Gods to the God of Israel have become distinct."⁷

The evidence that justifies this change of opinion is not in the main philological; of the two "potent sisters,"⁸

³ The late Julius Wellhausen, one of the most formidable critics of his day and the father of a great school of criticism, wrote in his *Prolegomena to the History of Israel* (English translation, 1885, pp. 318-19): "From the patriarchal narratives it is impossible to obtain any historical information regarding the patriarchs; we can only learn something about the time in which the stories about them were first told by the Israelite people. This later period with its essential and superficial characteristics was unintentionally projected back into hoary antiquity and is reflected there like a transfigured mirage." In other words, the stories about the patriarchs tell us much about the age in which these stories were committed to writing (in Wellhausen's judgment not less than a thousand years after the traditional date of Abraham), but little or nothing about the time at which the patriarchs are alleged to have lived.

⁴ Hinrichs, Leipzig, 1931.

⁵ Alt's contribution to this subject is entitled *Der Gott der Väter, ein Beitrag zur Vorgeschichte der israelitischen Religion*, Kohlhammer, Stuttgart, 1929.

⁶ *Op. cit.*, p. 49.

⁷ *Op. cit.*, p. 73.

⁸ W. F. Albright in *The Journal of the Palestine Oriental Society*, Vol. III, p. 121.

philology and archæology, it is the latter which has been chiefly responsible for the alteration. The proofs can only be given in a very summary way here; they may be found concisely stated in the works of Böhl and Alt already mentioned and, even more conveniently, in Dr. William Foxwell Albright's *The Archæology of Palestine and the Bible*.⁹ In the first place, as regards the conditions of life described in the patriarchal narratives, we can exactly reverse Wellhausen's picture. The conditions described do not at all agree with those prevalent in the Iron Age when the narratives are alleged by the advanced critics to have been written. On the other hand, they do agree most remarkably with the conditions of the Middle Bronze Age (2000-1600), when the patriarchs lived.¹⁰ To take only one point, the patriarchs in Genesis are presented to us as semi-nomads, that is as people occupied partly in sheep-raising and cattle-breeding and partly in cultivating the soil; they trek gradually up and down the land of Canaan, but they have definite bases to which they eventually return. Their wanderings are always "about the hill country of the extreme north of the Negeb, never on the coastal plains or in the desert."¹¹ Now, in Palestine at the present day we find the same type of semi-nomad, not settled in towns or permanent encampments like the so-called *Fellāhin*, yet not true nomads, despising agriculture and devoting their lives to desert wandering, like the Bedouin. The patriarchs are of the class known as 'Arab, yet they cover in their journeyings a vaster tract of country than does the ordinary 'Arab, and they wander between towns and settled districts. It is here that archæology helps to explain the situation. In the Middle and Late Bronze Ages, the hill country was but sparsely populated; almost all the *Fellāhin* population was in the coastal plains, Esdraelon and the Jordan valley. The countless *tells* that remain bear witness to the density of the population and prove that the regions

⁹ Revell, New York, second edition, 1933. See CLERGY REVIEW, Vol. VII, pp. 153-55. I am much indebted to Dr. Albright's treatment for the discussion of this topic.

¹⁰ On the various dates proposed for Abraham, see the article "Abraham" by M. L. Pirot in the *Supplément au Dictionnaire de la Bible*, t. I, coll. 8-14. Paris, 1928.

¹¹ Albright, *op. cit.*, p. 130.

just mentioned were more densely occupied in the Bronze Age than they were in the Iron Age or within recent times. This may be considered a small point, but it is of such small points (and there are many others to which reference could be made, if space permitted) that a reliable and consistently truthful narrative is built up.

Another question pertaining to the same general subject, that was regularly discussed by the critics of yesterday and often enough with sceptical conclusions, was the means by which the patriarchal narratives could have been transmitted. "Let us admit," the critics would say, "that there is some scanty evidence to justify our acceptance of Abraham, Isaac and Jacob as historical characters. We should still be faced with the incredible difficulties of transmitting their life-histories in detail over an interval of from three to four hundred years." Part of this reasoning was vitiated by the unwarranted assumption that no convenient script was available at that time and in that milieu for the transmission of documentary record.¹² But, even if one were to admit that no script was immediately available, the accuracy of the patriarchal narratives could still be explained in the light of two parallels suggested by Dr. Albright. The first is that of the Homeric epics, in particular the *Iliad*. We know that many earlier scholars considered the Mycenæan Age in Greece to be mythical or a reflection of later conditions. And we also know that, since the excavations of Schliemann and others, it has been found that, allowing for some anachronisms, the *Iliad* can be shown to be a sufficiently faithful record of the time in which its action is laid, the end of the Bronze Age. "The *Iliad* describes events which transpired in the thirteenth and twelfth centuries; it was compiled from older epic lays about the tenth or the ninth century, and was put into written form in the sixth century, more than six hundred years after the fall of Troy."¹³ Another parallel is provided by the *Rig Veda* which came into existence between 1800 and 1200 B.C., but was not committed to writing until the Greek period, i.e., after the third century B.C. It appears probable that the patriarchal

¹² See the *CLERGY REVIEW*, Vol. VII, pp. 149-150.

¹³ Albright, *op. cit.*, p. 144.

narratives were handed down in verse form, since a careful examination of the Pentateuchal writings shows that there are many examples of underlying verse narratives. In view of these and other considerations it is clear that we have travelled a long way already from Gunkel's scornful phrase: "Wenn es einmal einen Mann gegeben hätte, der Abraham hiess."¹⁴ As Albright remarks: "Practically all the Old Testament scholars of standing in Europe and America held these or similar views until very recently. Now, however, the situation is changing with the greatest rapidity, since the theory of Wellhausen will not bear the test of archæological examination."¹⁵ Even the great S. R. Driver with all his habitual insight and caution "came, for lack of evidence, to natural but wholly false results concerning the nature of the patriarchal stories of Genesis. Together with all the other members and friends of the Wellhausen school, he also accepted false premisses for his analysis of the historical evolution of Mosaic religion and arrived very logically at erroneous results."¹⁶ We may see in these and similar occurrences an element of irony—that the liberals, who so triumphantly asserted such a little time ago that their fundamental solution was unassailable and that the conservatives were obscurantists and haters of the light, are now being forced back, most unwillingly but inevitably, to the very positions that they claimed to have abandoned for ever. We may agree with Albright in the details of his criticism or we may disagree, but we can scarcely doubt that he has justification for writing: "Many ancient ideas regarding the Bible, and many more modern views concerning it, must be abandoned, but the progress of archæological investigation will make the Bible stand out more and more brightly against the background of the ancient East."¹⁷

I turn from this fundamental question to one of less importance which has, however, a certain interest, particularly at the present time. It is the question as to how far a knowledge of law is necessary for a student of the Pentateuch. The subject is raised by a writer who

¹⁴ *Die Genesis*, p. lxxix.

¹⁵ *Op. cit.*, p. 128.

¹⁶ *Op. cit.*, p. 176.

¹⁷ *Op. cit.*, p. 177.

was, at one and the same time, a competent Old Testament scholar and a trained lawyer—the late Harold Marcus Wiener.¹⁸

For the text on which I am commenting, I must refer to his *Posthumous Essays* edited for the Oxford Press in 1932 by Mr. Herbert Loewe, the University Lecturer in Rabbinics at Cambridge.¹⁹ In this small volume of only 145 pages there is an essay on "The Need for a Jewish Biblical Scholarship," which sets out the problem I am discussing with all the author's well-known fearlessness and pugnacity. The general subject is outside the province of this paper, but there are several pages that are relevant. His premisses are that the Pentateuch contains a great deal of matter that would ordinarily be discussed by those who are learned in the law, not by theologians or philologists. Law, as Wiener says, is a highly technical subject. "If an event occurs which involves the consideration of legal questions, a wise layman whose interests are affected would not dream of applying to an eminent professor of theology or philology, but will put the matter in the hands of a trained lawyer and be guided by his advice" (p. 81).

Wiener, as he explains, was not an Alttestamentler *ab ovo*, but his reading of ancient law as a law-student suggested to him that, in English legal circles, no use was made of the system of ancient law which was unquestionably the best known of all to the bulk of

¹⁸ Wiener was born in London, on October 28th, 1875, and, after taking a good degree at Cambridge, was called to the Bar in May, 1901. He was a member of Lincoln's Inn and became an equity draughtsman and conveyancer. In 1924, at the age of forty-nine, he was able to give effect to the dream of half a lifetime and to settle in Palestine the home of his ancestors. There, during the five years of his residence, he was above all a minister of peace among the various discordant factions. His household was made up of Christians, Jews and Moslems, and it was while he was driving his two gardeners to their homes during the 1929 riots that he met his untimely death. He was surrounded by a mob of infuriated Arabs who demanded to know who he was. "Ana Yahudi!" (I am a Jew), cried Wiener; he was instantly set upon and fatally assaulted (August 23rd, 1929). It is to the credit of the Jerusalem *fellāhīn* that it was not they, but Bedouin from the desert, who put to death so great a friend and benefactor of the people of the Holy Land.

¹⁹ See CLERGY REVIEW, Vol. V., p. 158.

Englishmen; secondly, a more vital point: "If there was such a thing as growth in legal history, we have an independent standard by which to try the question of the antiquity of the Pentateuchal legislation." On turning to the Bible he found the chapter in which Jeremias buys land by means of a written document, duly sealed and attested (Jer. xxxii.). Then, he says, he knew that the laws of the Pentateuch were "centuries older than the time of the prophet [sixth c. B.C.], for they belong to a much earlier stage of legal development" (p. 82). In the patriarchal period, as the story of Abraham's purchase of the cave of Machpelah would prove (Genesis (xxiii.)), there was no written document; the transaction was effected by carrying out the purchase in the most public place possible, at the gate of the city which was the seat of judgment. On turning to the critics for some explanation of their failure to recognize the development of legislation in this and other cases, he realized that they were writing about laws while lacking the most elementary legal training. "They were to be found putting forward as the fruit of serious scholarship, blunders that would have disgraced a first-year law student, and they never consulted experts. The lesson of Plato's *Apology* was entirely lost on them. They had no idea why it was that Socrates was the wisest of the Greeks" (p. 83).

For years he attempted to bring home to the leading Old Testament scholars their inadequacies in this respect. At last, after fifteen years, he succeeded in persuading Professor Böhl, then of Groningen, to consult a law professor on certain points. Professor Welch of Edinburgh, another critic of some independence, came to admit that laws required the interpretation of lawyers, and Löhr, in his commentary on Deuteronomy,²⁰ abandoned the Wellhausen case and pronounced for a Mosaic code in Deuteronomy. Apart from these three instances, Wiener was unsuccessful. Nearly twenty-five years of labour were insufficient for persuading the critics to do what any person of sanity would do in a few hours in a matter affecting his personal interests.

I should not be prepared to go further and to assert with Wiener that the conduct of such critics suggests

²⁰ *Das Deuteronomium*, 1925.

an imperfect belief in their own case. But we must agree, I think, that theirs is a lamentable deficiency and that, just as it is perfectly well recognized that the experts in archæology, Semitic languages and the natural sciences have a right to be heard on many questions of Old Testament criticism, so it is with the experts of the legal profession, particularly now, when the trail has been blazed in respect of cognate studies. The Code of Hammurapi (c. 2000 B.C.), a twelfth century (B.C.) Assyrian Code and a thirteenth century (B.C.) Hittite code are now being studied comparatively by expert jurists.²¹ In the case of the Bible, I noted with great satisfaction in the preface to a recent commentary on Exodus by a German Catholic professor, Dr. Paul Heinisch, an acknowledgment of help received from a colleague at Nymwegen, the professor of legal history and civil law who "was so kind as to give me some legal wrinkles for the interpretation of the Book of the Covenant."²² May such an association continue to flourish. We are accustomed to the friendliest relations between canon lawyers and civil lawyers; may this be extended to the study of biblical exegesis in which each of the two parties has so much to contribute and so much to receive.

My third and last topic is suggested by a remark made by the former Dean of St. Paul's at the recent twenty-first Conference of Modern Churchmen. He was speaking on "The Use and Misuse of the Bible"²³ and, apropos of the Gospels, delivered himself of this pronouncement: "You may take it as certain—very few scholars hold a different view—that the Fourth Gospel was written not by the son of Zebedee, who was probably martyred by the Jews, as Our Lord seems to have foretold, but by an unknown Christian of Ephesus between A.D. 100 and 115" (pp. 253-54). Now here, as in other instances, I believe that Dr. Inge is quite out of date and that he is relying for the statement about St. John's martyrdom

²¹ See Albright: *The Archaeology of Palestine and the Bible*, p. 152.

²² *Das Buch Exodus*, Hanstein, Bonn, 1934. See the *CLERGY REVIEW*, Vol. VIII, pp. 150-51.

²³ See *The Modern Churchman*, Vol. XXIV, October, 1934, pp. 245-58.

upon a desperate and unnatural interpretation of historical data which cannot resist the advance of scholarship. At one time, it is true, no argument seemed more formidable than that concerning the alleged martyrdom at an early age of John the son of Zebedee. For various reasons it is certain that the Fourth Gospel was written after A.D. 70. And if it could be shown that John was martyred with his brother James in the year 42, it would be clear that the Gospel, at least in its present form, could not have been written by John.

Of the proofs adduced in favour of John's early martyrdom, only one need be seriously considered. It is the supposed testimony of Papias, Bishop of Hierapolis in Phrygia, who was born about A.D. 70 and died about A.D. 146. We only know him in extracts and most of the extracts are to be found in the text of Eusebius's *Ecclesiastical History*. In the case under consideration this is not so. The critics in this instance are relying upon a seventh or eighth century Epitome of the history of Philip of Side (fl. c. A.D. 450); in this epitome the statement occurs: "Papias in the second book says that John the Divine and James his brother were killed by the Jews." The text of the Epitome was printed by de Boor in *Texte und Untersuchungen*, v. 2 (1888). The testimony of the Epitome is reproduced in part by a ninth century writer, Georgios Hamartolos (the Sinner), who claims that both the sons of Zebedee met violent ends as was foretold, he says, in Mark x. 39, by Christ Himself. The only authority for this story of John's early martyrdom is Philip of Side or his epitomizer, whereas, from the second century onwards, the Church has accepted the statement of Irenæus that St. John died a natural death.²⁴

Is this testimony of any value? In reply to the critics, including, no doubt, Dr. Inge, who still attach some importance to it, one may answer:

1. The character of Philip of Side as a historian is,

²⁴ Among recent authorities who have dealt with this question one may mention Dr. J. H. Bernard in the introduction to the *Gospel According to St. John* in the "International Critical Commentary," Edinburgh, 1929, Vol. I, pp. xxxviii.-xlii. There is an excellent treatment of the subject in Mr. H. P. V. Nunn's *The Son of Zebedee and the Fourth Gospel*, London, 1927, pp. 1-59.

as it happens, known to us from the works of his contemporary Socrates, the historian,³⁵ who says that he was a laborious student, but that his history was useless, since it was loose and inexact, especially in matters of chronology.

2. It is more than doubtful whether Philip ever had access to Papias's own works; he appears to have relied upon Eusebius. And, though the argument from silence needs careful handling, it is at least of some significance that not one of the writers who had the works of Papias in his hands (notably Irenæus and Eusebius), says anything about John's martyrdom by the Jews in any of his extant writings.

3. On studying the words of Philip or his epitomizer, we can be sure that the title "the Divine" was added at a date later than the time of Papias. The statement in Papias can only have been that: "John and James his brother were killed by the Jews."

4. There have been numerous conjectures as to the exact form that the original quotation may have taken. Lightfoot suggested that a line has dropped out of the text and that the true reading was: "Papias said that John was relegated to Patmos by the king of the Romans and that James was killed by the Jews."³⁶ Zahn and Funk considered that there was a confusion between John the Baptist (who was killed by the Jews in the person of Herod Antipas, the tetrarch of Galilee and Perea) and John the son of Zebedee. It seems better, perhaps, to hold with Archbishop Bernard in the introduction to his *St. John* that there is a confusion here between James the son of Zebedee and James the brother of the Lord (Justus), and that the text, reproduced or rather perverted by Philip or his epitomizer, was that found in the text of Eusebius's *Chronicle* as it is given to us by St. Jerome, the Armenian version and the Greek history of Syncellus, which is based upon Eusebius. It runs in this form: "The brother of the Lord, James, who was called by all Justus, was killed with stones by the Jews." It is not difficult to suppose that a corruption slipped in here, and that in place of ὁ ἀδελφὸς τοῦ Κυρίου Ἰάκωβος, the text was made to read: ὁ ἀδελφὸς αὐτοῦ καὶ Ἰάκωβος. This

³⁵ *Ecclesiastical History*, VII, 27.

³⁶ *Contemporary Review*, Vol. XXVI, pp. 852 ff.

seems to be as near as we can get to the truth. In spite of the weight of critical authority (and such names as Bacon, Wellhausen, Moffatt, Burkitt, and Charles might impress those with little experience of these critics' omnipresent fallibility), we may conclude, with Dr. Bernard, whose study of the subject is, one would like to think, definitive: "All that can be said with confidence is that the sentence as found in the *Epitome* is corrupt, and that no historical inference can be drawn from a corrupt sentence in a late epitome of the work of a careless and blundering historian. To base upon de Boor's fragment an argument for the martyrdom of John the son of Zebedee is, as Harnack has said, 'an uncritical caprice.'"²⁷

I regard this as the most serious objection that has been made in terms of external criticism against the traditional attribution of the Fourth Gospel to the son of Zebedee. But it may be urged: "After all, the question is not so very important. Whether the book was written by John or by some unknown disciple or even by some disciple of the Apostles, does not make very much difference. It still contains the saving words of eternal life; it is still the most beautiful book in the world, the book that of all others tells us most about Jesus, the Incarnate Word, the interpreter of the Father to mankind." I cannot agree with this criticism. It is not, of course, true to say that the human authorship of a book is in any necessary and inevitable way connected with its inspired character or essential veracity.²⁸ But, in the case of St. John's Gospel we have what claims to be a most intimate presentation of Our Lord's life and teaching, set down by one who shows by many indications that he was an eye-witness of the events which he records. To sweep away the whole weight of external testimony and the detailed and convincing

²⁷ *Op. cit.*, Vol. I, p. xlii.

²⁸ The question is discussed with his usual acumen by the late P. Hildebrand Höpfl, O.S.B., in his *Introductionis . . . Compendium*, Vol. III, pp. 17 ff., Rome, 1929. It is significant that he regards the question concerning the authorship of the Fourth Gospel as one which may be said "nexum habere cum doctrina fidei" . . . "in hoc casu debet recipi sententia, quam Ecclesia semper retinuit, et opinio contraria meretur vocari temeraria," p. 18.

results of internal criticism would be to substitute anonymous testimony in place of first-hand evidence. Either the writer of the Gospel was John the son of Zebedee (no other *known* apostle or disciple will suit the circumstances of writing and the internal evidence) or he was somebody quite unknown to us, whose very existence as a member of the apostolic circle or body of disciples is disputable. I will not consider here the enigmatic figure of John the Presbyter.²⁹

In a short but suggestive contribution to the volume *Lightfoot of Durham*,³⁰ Dr. Headlam, the Anglican bishop of Gloucester, enumerates the gains to the orthodox and traditional view that we owe largely to the influence of Lightfoot and his fellow-workers: "We know," he writes, "that the great body of the Pauline epistles are genuine, if not the pastorals; we have advanced nearly as far as is possible in the solution of the Synoptic problem; we have no doubt that the Acts of the Apostles and St. Luke's Gospel were by the author that tradition assigns to them. We have not solved the Johannine problem, but we know that the writings ascribed to St. John cannot be much later, at the latest, than the beginning of the second century. We know the dates of the Apostolic Fathers."³¹ In fact, we may apply to the problems of New Testament criticism those fine verses of Mr. Chesterton in his dedication to *The Man that was Thursday*:

"But we were young; we lived to see God break their bitter charms,

God and the good Republic come riding back in arms:
We have seen the city of Mansoul even as it rocked,
relieved—

Blessed are they who did not see, but being blind,
believed."

We may be certain of two things at least—that learning

²⁹ See Père M.-J. Lagrange, O.P., *Evangelie selon Saint Jean*, Paris, 1925, pp. xxix.-xxxiv.

³⁰ Cambridge Press, 1933. See CLERGY REVIEW, Vol. VI, pp. 400-401.

³¹ *Op. cit.*, pp. 140-141. Needless to say this does not represent the Catholic position, but it is useful as showing the minimum that one not over-orthodox critic considers to be indispensable.

and scholarship have still many contributions to make to the quest for a fuller and more profound knowledge of the Bible, and that, between the certain discoveries of scientific research and the certain conclusions of Catholic theology, there will never be any real contradiction, since the same God is author of both the natural and the supernatural orders. To those who have fears for the future, to those who mistrust the evidence for a more conservative and traditional tendency in much of the present-day exegesis, I would oppose a phrase occurring in an open letter from Mr. Belloc to the late Mr. C. F. G. Masterman. The latter had been deploring the apparent increase of scepticism. Mr. Belloc, with that high courage and inspiration that are so conspicuously his, answered him in words that I quote from memory: "You have mistaken the hour of the night; it is already morning."

PROFESSOR POLLARD, MR. BELLOC AND THE ABBÉ CONSTANT

A QUESTION OF EVIDENCE.

BY THE REV. ANDREW BECK, A.A., B.A.

THE recent publication of an English translation of Professor Constant's study of the beginnings of the Reformation in this country,¹ and a series of articles on "official" history by Mr. Belloc in the *Universe* have again raised the question of the position of Anne Boleyn in the history of the Reformation in England, and the story of Henry VIII's supposed project of obtaining an annulment of his marriage with Catherine of Aragon as early as 1514. Furthermore, a new piece of evidence on this question of an early "divorce" has come to light within recent months; admittedly scanty, but claimed to be of sound corroborative value.

Professor Pollard is chiefly responsible for the suggestion that Henry was toying with the idea in 1514, principally because Catherine was unable to bear him sons who could live for any length of time. He first made the suggestion in his *Henry VIII*² as long ago as 1902, and repeated it more recently, with references to further documents, in his *Wolsey*.³

In 1930 Constant's *La Réforme en Angleterre* appeared, and he also supported the view that Henry had considered an annulment in 1514, but had abandoned the project for both domestic and political reasons. In the same year Mr. Belloc published his *Wolsey*,⁴ and in a

¹ *The Reformation in England*. Sheed & Ward, 1934. 16s.

² First published with magnificent Holbein reproductions by Messrs. Goupil. A cheaper edition (Longmans, 8s.) was published in 1905, and has been frequently reprinted. For this edition Dr. Pollard inserted all his references to the original documents. I quote from the 1930 impression.

³ Longmans, 1929. 21s. pp. 19 and 283.

⁴ Cassell. 15s.

special appendix discussed most of the evidence for the earlier date, and decided against it. The appendix consists of an examination of the six documents referred to by Pollard, and concludes: "Of the six documents, only two are written on the spot in England, and neither knows anything of a divorce. Four of the six are official and know nothing about it. Only one has a reference. It is from a merchant who had no access to the Court. It is the most distant, the least informed, and, even so, talks of it as mere gossip." The actual document round which the discussion centres is short enough and interesting enough to quote in full. It is No. 479 in Volume II of the *Calendar of State Papers, Venetian*, is a translation from the Italian text of the Sanuto Diaries, and is printed on p. 188.

479. Vettor Lippomano to —
Dated Rome, 28th August.

The Ambassador, Lando, was better and in bed, but had been very ill. On the 26th letters were received from France, dated the 15th, announcing the proclamation of the agreement made with the King of England and of the marriage, which was concluded, so that the King of France would not come into Italy this year, though it was said he would give his second daughter to the Archduke of Burgundy. It was also said that the King of England meant to repudiate his present wife, the daughter of the King of Spain and his brother's widow, because he is unable to have children by her, and intends to marry a daughter of the French Duke of Bourbon.

The French Ambassador at Rome has received letters from the French Court, dated the 14th August, whereby it appeared that for this year the King would not come into Italy, and was expecting the Queen from England, great entertainments being in preparation for her in France. The late Cardinal of England was suspected to have died by poison; one of his chaplains charged with the murder had been imprisoned in the Castle [of S. Angelo], and had there destroyed himself; whereupon the Pope had the body hanged in public, and afterwards quartered. Certain other individuals had also been arrested. It seems the chaplain had confessed that an Englishman (*uno del paese d'Inghilterra*) had instigated him to do the deed, though the truth would now be ascertained through these other prisoners.

According to report (*si dize*) the King of England demands a million ducats from the Emperor on account of his

* *Wolsey*. Note H, pp. 311-313.

expenditure in the war last year in France. He means to annul his own marriage, and will obtain what he wants from the Pope, as France did with Pope Julius (sic).⁶

Belloc's book was given a column review in the *Observer*, November 2nd, 1930, by Professor Pollard. The book was severely criticized as spectacular and superficial, and the reviewer concluded that "if students desire, as they should, to read serious presentations of the Catholic view of the Reformation, they will be wise to go to the Abbé Constant's *La Réforme en Angleterre* (1930), relegating Mr. Belloc's book to its appropriate but transient place on the shelves of circulating libraries, perhaps a little above Mr. Hackett's *Henry VIII.*" Among other things he said: "Hence he has a special appendix to explain away the now accepted fact that a divorce was mooted in 1514; 'l'idée première du divorce,' writes the Abbé Constant—a real historian as well as a real Catholic—'ne fut donc pas inspirée à Henri VIII par sa passion pour Anne Boleyn qui n'avait alors que sept ans.'"

Mr. Belloc replied to this criticism in a long letter published in the same paper on the following Sunday, November 9th. With regard to the 1514 date for the divorce, he wrote:

Professor Pollard calls his new theory "a now accepted fact" and quotes in support of such a claim the recent and admirable French work of Constant, implying that I had not seen that book and that it contained evidence further supporting the new theory. But the idea that Henry was working for a divorce eleven or twelve years before his arrangements with Anne is not "an accepted fact," nor ever will be, unless or until Professor Pollard can bring some sort of solid evidence for it. If Professor Pollard had really read pages 310, 311 and 312 of my book he would have found that I there gave full reasons for rejecting the worthless shred of evidence which he put up to support his new theory as its sole author. All that he can bring forward is a few lines of chance gossip written by an Italian hundreds of miles away, the writer himself not vouching for them and having no particular knowledge of the matter. If so enormous a thing as the divorce of the English King from his Spanish Queen had been afoot from 1514 onwards

⁶ A note at the foot of the page points out that Alexander VI is obviously meant. The Cardinal referred to was Christopher Bainbridge who died on July 17th, 1514 (*Ven. Cal.*, II, 449). Belloc tells the story, pp. 138-139.

all Europe would have been filled with it, as indeed all Europe *was* filled with it when it really did arise eleven to thirteen years later under the influence of Anne Boleyn. I further showed that of Professor Pollard's five independent references quoted in support of his theory every one turned out on examination of the original to have no single word about the divorce policy from beginning to end. I give on pages 312 and 313 full names, details and dates of these documents. Yet Professor Pollard, whose business it should be to meet such criticism, simply suppresses it.

As for the implication that had I known of Constant's work I should have seen that it gave Professor Pollard independent support, I can only say that I was perhaps the first man in England to receive that book, that I have been in correspondence with its learned author, and that I read it at once most carefully, with all its voluminous notes and text. I don't suppose Professor Pollard has done so much, but if he will do so now, he will find that there is no confirmation of his date "1514." There is not a scrap of new evidence. There is only (on page 21) a repetition of what Professor Pollard himself had written. Nor do I believe that Constant would have made this error if he had looked up, as I did, the supposed supporting evidence and discovered that it was not there at all.

This letter evoked a reply from Professor Pollard in the ensuing issue of the *Observer*, November 16th.

Mr. Belloc's methods of controversy do not make it a pleasant duty to reply. Six times in the course of his letter he repeats his disgraceful insinuation that I had not read the book I was reviewing. . . . Mr. Belloc once more: "I don't suppose Professor Pollard has done so much" as read M. Constant's book, which I recommend to readers. Why do charges of literary dishonesty flow so readily from Mr. Belloc's pen? As a matter of fact, I read and wrote a long and detailed review of M. Constant's text and notes for a learned periodical last June. Mr. Belloc's letter, like his history, consists mainly of his unfounded suppositions.

To turn to points of historical importance: I described the mooting of the divorce in 1514 as a "now accepted fact" because, apart from myself, it had been accepted by M. Constant and Mr. Brodie in his new edition of Vol. I of the *Letter and Papers of Henry VIII* (pref. pp. xx-xxi.),⁷ each of whom has spent the best part of a lifetime on the Tudor period, and it has not been disputed by any reputable

⁷ Brewer's first edition appeared in 1862. The *Venetian Calendar* was published by Rawdon Brown in 1867; and Brodie's second edition of the *Letters and Papers* came out in 1920. The documents in it are usually quoted as *L. and P.*, followed by the numbers of the volume and the document.

historian. It has been accepted because the evidence on which it is based, so far from being "the chance gossip" of "a merchant who had no access to the Court," as Mr. Belloc supposes, is a dispatch to his Government from a Venetian diplomatist who wrote every week and reported his conversations with Leo X and his cardinals, and the contents of the dispatches which his colleagues in the diplomatic corps communicated to him.

Two further letters appeared, on November 30th and December 7th. In the first Mr. Belloc, writing from Rome, made the point that Professor Pollard had evaded the issue by refusing to make any reply to the arguments developed in the *Wolsey* Note. "Had Professor Pollard read those pages of mine, he would certainly have attempted a reply."

To this Professor Pollard wrote:

I had, in fact, already in 1904, in my *Henry VIII* (p. 176), given the one and only reference which Mr. Belloc now considers appropriate. But when, twenty-five years later, I had occasion to deal with the matter again, it occurred to me that a careless reader might do, what Mr. Belloc has done, and "suppose" that my authority for the divorce project of 1514 was the "chance gossip" of "a merchant who had no access to the court," and so forth. I therefore, besides referring readers to my *Henry VIII*, added references to show how nearly the circumstances of 1514 resembled those of 1527-8 when the project was seriously resumed, to explain the original suggestion, and to substantiate the credibility of the witness, none of which factors was relevant to the fact.

I did not, however, imagine that it would be worth anyone's while to resort to the threadbare trick of pretending that each and every document cited in support of a paragraph, containing a dozen lines and as many facts, "should" severally "prove" the one detail a critic chooses to challenge.

In this letter it looks as though "relevant" should read "irrelevant," and in any case the first paragraph is rather obscure. The correspondence in the *Observer*, however, did not continue; but Belloc gave a long account of the question at issue in the *Universe* for January 30th, 1931, in an article entitled "Whitewashing Henry VIII." He pointed out that contemporaries looked on Anne Boleyn as the cause of the whole trouble. It was a thing on which there could be no question.

The truth standing thus, it was clear that the break with

Rome, into which the unfortunate King was somewhat reluctantly forced, had a very unpleasant origin, and that origin lends its distasteful colour to all the first part of the Reformation story in England. It would be a great feather in the cap of those who desire to glorify the English Reformation if they could give it a nobler origin, or at any rate one less disgusting; hence the recent creation of the myth to which I allude.

He then went on to deal with the Lippomano letter (with its error of fact concerning the name of the Pope) and showed that it was very flimsy evidence *if taken alone*. Pollard had used it, but had backed it up with five other references—in not one of which was there the least mention of the divorce! He concluded:

I think this example deserves to be given as wide a publicity as possible. Professor Pollard is notoriously anti-Catholic, and indeed that is only to be expected. I can only hope that the exposure has come in time to prevent the myth from spreading.

There the matter rested for a time, but within the last few months it has again received prominence. In the issue of the *Bulletin of the Institute of Historical Research* for February, 1934, Miss Betty Behrens, who has been doing research work in Rome, published *A Note on Henry VIII's Divorce Project of 1514*.^{*} After summarizing the position as left after the *Wolsey* correspondence she admitted that the "only evidence so far brought forward" was the dispatch written by the Venetian on August 28th, 1514, and added a further admission: "The Venetian diplomatist, however, got his information not first-hand in Rome but from letters sent from France where, it might be held, the wish was father to the thought; and his statement is scarcely conclusive proof to those of Mr. Belloc's way of thinking who refuse to be convinced except by 'some solid sort of evidence.' There is therefore a value in showing that evidence of the kind that Mr. Belloc demands does in fact exist." Miss Behrens goes on to deal with the cataloguing done in the Vatican secret archives by their keeper, Garampi, and his assistants between 1749 and 1772. They made a vast number of notes from manuscripts, each on a separate slip of paper, and these

^{*} pp. 163, 164.

slips were later pasted into twenty volumes.⁹

In the volume *Miscellanea I*, f. 173b, under the heading "England" and the date "1514," occurs an entry which seems to bear on the question: "Archetypus epistolae scribendae a Pontifice ad Henricum Angliae regem super pretensa nullitate matrimoniis."¹⁰ Apparently the letter was to be some sort of Papal document, but this is not very clear.

There seems little doubt, from what Miss Behrens goes on to say, that Garampi is reliable as to the date, but the document can apparently no longer be traced and "the officials of the archives are afraid that it is irretrievably lost." Presumably the entry refers to a letter to be written to Henry concerning his mooted divorce from Catherine, but it is terribly slender testimony and scarcely the "solid sort of evidence" one was expecting. In 1514 the marriage question might, for example, have been one of the intricate marital relationships of Charles Brandon, the "larron" who had recently been made Duke of Suffolk,¹¹ and it seems a big assumption on the part of Miss Behrens to conclude that "the coincidence of the separate testimonies of Garampi and the Venetian ambassador¹² must surely be proof enough."

⁹ She quotes G. Brom, *Guide aux Archives du Vatican* (1911 edition), p. 8, *et sq.*

¹⁰ Miss Behrens adds the note: "Sic: the grammar suggests that the words 'pretensa nullitate' should be in brackets."

¹¹ See Pollard, *Henry VIII*, pp. 80 and 199, quoting *Ven. Cal.*, II, 464, and *D.N.B.*, s.v. Brandon; also *L. and P.*, IV, 737 and 5859.

¹² *Sic*. Lippomano was not an ambassador. His father Tomà was a banker and Belloc says that this also was Vettor's profession (*Wolsey*, p. 311). But the fact is not certain. His brother Lorenzo is called a "merchant of Venice" (*Ven. Cal.*, II, 253), but Vettor himself is merely referred to as a "valuable contributor to the Diaries" (*ibid.*, II, 489, note). The *Sanuto Diaries* were compiled by Marin Sanuto in Venice, and consist of all sorts of documents, largely summaries of letters both public and private, with which he became acquainted and which he entered in the diary, sometimes adding notes and comments of his own.

In July, 1934, appeared the English version of Constant's book with a preface by Belloc containing a warning to readers that "in the first pages in the Divorce our author follows Pollard too closely. The evidence of a first attempt at divorce in 1514 is quite insufficient." A comparison of Constant's work in English with a great deal of Pollard's *Henry VIII* brings out most strikingly the truth of Belloc's contention that Constant has depended too much on Pollard and in fact is not an independent witness at all. Closer examination shows that there is a very marked textual dependence which is even a little disconcerting. This was not so evident in the French edition where all the notes were relegated to the end of the book, but it is very striking in the English translation where text and notes occur on the same page. I give a few instances, with the references, as quoted by the authors, in brackets:—

(a) Pollard, p. 180, 1. 2: Stephen stood to Matilda in precisely the same relation as James V of Scotland stood to Princess Mary; and in 1532, as soon as he came of age, James was urged to style himself "Prince of England" and Duke of York, in manifest derogation of Mary's title [*L. and P.*, V, 609, 817].

Constant, p. 45, in n. 39: James V of Scotland, by his mother Margaret, Henry VII's daughter, was to Mary what Stephen, Henry I's nephew, had been to Matilda. Accordingly, as soon as his age allowed him (1532) he took the title of "Prince of England and Duke of York," a manifest derogation of Mary's rights [*L. and P.*, V, 609, 817].

On the same page in Constant, n. 39 should be compared with Pollard, p. 180, and n. 41 with Pollard p. 183.

(b) Pollard, p. 181-182. The whole paragraph (beginning "These rival pretensions") especially . . . Buckingham's . . . hopes of the Crown cost him his head; he had always been discontented with Tudor rule, especially under Wolsey . . . in 1521, the Duke was tried by his peers, found guilty of high treason and sent to the block. . . . [See detailed account in *L. and P.*, III, 1284, 1356]. Buckingham was executed, not because he was a criminal, but because he was, or might become, dangerous. His crime was not treason, but

descent from Edward III. . . . [Brewer regards the hostility of Wolsey to Buckingham as one of Polydore Vergil's "calumnies." *L. and P.*, vol. III, introd. p. lxvi.].

p. 50, 1. 16: . . . while Buckingham, the only Duke in England, and his brother, the Earl of Wiltshire, were rigidly excluded by dynastic jealousy from all share in political authority.

Constant, p. 45, 1. 7: The question of succession made Henry suspicious at an early stage. The Duke of Buckingham had had hopes of the Crown; he paid for them with his life. He was accused of treason in 1521, tried by his peers and beheaded. His crime consisted in being a descendant of Edward III. n. 42 [*L. and P.*, III, 1284, 1356]. It is thought, the Venetian Ambassador wrote, that the Duke might easily succeed the King if the latter died without leaving a male heir [*L. and P.*, I, 180, 233, 319]. Through dynastic jealousy, he had been excluded from all participation in political authority; so also had his brother, the Earl of Wiltshire. Little satisfied with Tudor government, he was still less satisfied under Wolsey, whose hostility—due according to Brewer [*L. and P.*, III, p. lxvi.] to one of Polydore Vergil's calumnies—hastened his end [*ibid.*, 1; cf. II, 3793]. (All these references are in Pollard, pp. 182 and 38.)

(c) Pollard, p. 177-178: . . . and in 1519 he undertook to lead a crusade against the Turk in person if he should have an heir [*L. and P.*, III, 432]. But physicians summoned from Spain were no more successful than their English colleagues. By 1525 the last ray of hope had flickered out. Catherine was then forty years old; and Henry, at the age of thirty-four in the full vigour of youthful manhood, seemed doomed by the irony of fate, and by his union with Catherine, to leave a disputed inheritance.

Constant, p. 44: In 1519 Henry made a vow that he would personally conduct a crusade against the Turks if a son were born to him [*L. and P.*, III, 432]. He was not satisfied with consulting English doctors, but brought others from Spain. All his efforts were unsuccessful. In 1525 Catherine of Aragon had reached

her fortieth year, and left Henry, who was but thirty-four, no hope of an undisputed succession.¹³

Not merely in the history surrounding the project of 1514 does Constant seem to be second-hand; in Chapter I the same dependence on Pollard is manifest. I give two examples out of a dozen collected haphazard.

(a) C., p. 28-29: "The purifying of the English Parliament was, generally speaking, the death agony of a dying government."

P., p. 261: "The packing of Parliaments has in fact been generally the death-bed expedient of a moribund

¹³ The following passages may also be compared (C. = Constant; P. = Pollard): C., p. 44, n. 35, and P., p. 176, l. 22; C., p. 45, n. 40, and P., p. 177, l. 18 (with the same quotation); C., p. 56, n. 69, and P., p. 192, n. 1 (with the same quotation), 203, 204; C., p. 43, n. 33, second para., and P., pp. 185, 186 (C.'s reference to Taunton is inaccurate, but this may be a misprint. Taunton's reference is to *L. and P.*, IV, 3784. P. quotes *L. and P.*, IV, 3748, which is correct. C. quotes Taunton only); C., p. 47, n. 48, and P., p. 176, l. 8 (why does C. quote *Ven. Cal.*, II, 479?); C., p. 44, n. 38 and 39, and P., p. 179, l. 20, and p. 180, l. 12 (with same reference to Fortescue's *Governance of England*); C., p. 46, n. 43, and P., pp. 183, 184, and n. 2 (identical references); C., p. 46, nn. 44 and 45, and P., pp. 184, 187; C., p. 47, l. 16, and P., p. 187, last line; C., p. 49, and P., pp. 189, 191 (identical quotation); C., p. 50, l. 3, and P., p. 191, l. 14; C., p. 53, nn. 64, 65, and P., pp. 198, 199 (with identical references, and an additional one by C., apparently added later. The dates in C. and P. do not coincide); C., pp. 54, 55, and P., pp. 200, 202, 203, 219; C., p. 55, n. 69, and P., p. 203, l. 4; C., p. 56, n. 69, and P., p. 203, l. 25; C., p. 56, n. 71, and P., p. 206, n. 2; C., p. 58, l. 1-3, and P., p. 214, l. 19; C., p. 61, n. 85, and P., p. 216, l. 10; C., p. 61 (the English people, he said, "would think I had come to hoodwink them, and might resent it. You know how much that would involve"), and P., p. 217 (the English, he said, "would think that I had come to hoodwink them, and might resent it. You know how much that would involve"); C., p. 73, and P., pp. 247-248. I have noticed remarkable similarity on later pages thus: C., pp. 125, 126, and P., pp. 326, 268; C., pp. 127-8, and P., p. 329 (a long passage, this): C., p. 151, and P., p. 341; C., p. 192, and P., p. 341 (a sweeping judgment on constitutional issues—typically Pollard). But I have not examined the latter part of the book so carefully.

government."¹⁴

(b) C., p. 31, n. 129: "In order to conclude from the harmony which existed between Henry and his Parliament that the latter was servile, it would be necessary to prove that Parliament acted against its will. But nothing shows at all that it manifested any discontent over the Bills adopted, not even over that which later gave the Royal decrees force of law."

P., p. 261-262: "But while Parliament was neither packed nor terrorized to any great extent, the harmony which prevailed between it and the King naturally led to the charge of servility. Insomuch as it was servile at all, Parliament faithfully represented its constituents; but the mere coincidence between the wishes of Henry and those of Parliament is no proof of servility. That accusation can only be substantiated by showing that Parliament did, not what it wanted, but what it did not want, out of deference to Henry. And that has never been proved. It has never been shown that the nation resented the statutes giving Henry's proclamations the force of laws. . . ."¹⁵

Even the example quoted by Mr. Belloc in the Preface (Warham's attitude to the Royal Supremacy; Constant, p. 32, n. 133) is no more than a re-arrangement of Pollard's two notes on p. 271. Similarly in Chapter III, the reference to Warham is taken from Pollard. Thus C., p. 95,

"The French edition (p. 14) gave: "L'épuration du Parlement en Angleterre fut en général l'agonie d'un gouvernement moribond," which does not truly render Pollard's meaning. Father Scantlebury has told me that he has "not even seen Pollard's book, and so did not use it" while doing the translation. The extraordinary fidelity of the translated passages to the English originals is a splendid tribute to Father Scantlebury's competence as a translator. "Packing" was an awkward case.

¹⁵ Page 27 of Constant is made up practically *verbatim* from phrases in Pollard. In "order of appearance" they are taken from pp. 291, 264, 291, 265, 266, 252, 263, 264, 292 and 264. On p. 28 I think that every sentence (including all the references to Nichols, Foxe, Hallam, Dasent and Merriman), except the last six lines, comes from Pollard in the following order: pp. 253, 252, 255, 260, 261, 252 (wrong reference in C.), 253, 254, 252, 254, 255, 260. (Note 116 does not faithfully render the meaning of Pollard's remark on p. 255.) P. 23 is almost as bad when compared with Pollard, pp. 235, 234, 237, 271 and 292. Compare also C., p. 8 and P., pp. 321, 311-314.

with n. 16=P., p. 286, with n. 1. (Note the reference to Stubbs.) In fact, Pollard, p. 269, is much more forceful than Constant, p. 85, n. 181. The important lines on p. 104, however, seem to be from another source, but are well enough known.¹⁶

There are some cases in the book, out of those which I have examined, in which the author appears to have quoted original documents without having looked up or verified his references. Naturally, this is not an easy point to prove, because, presumably, the references were correct in the work from which they were copied. But here are one or two cases which are suggestive.

(a) Pollard, after urging that the anti-papal feeling in England helped Henry in the divorce case, continues (p. 251): "There were few Englishmen who would not resent the petition presented to the Pope in 1529 by Charles V and Ferdinand that the English Parliament should be forbidden to discuss the question of divorce." He quotes *Sp. Cal.*, III, 979.

Constant (p. 5): "When Charles begged the Pope to forbid the English Parliament to discuss the divorce there were very few Englishmen who were not openly indignant." He quotes *Sp. Cal.*, III, 979, and *L. and P.*, VII, 193.

Now the Spanish Calendar reference (it should be Part 2, page 979, no. 667) is the petition of the Imperial Ambassadors to the Pope respecting the Divorce Case. The sixth point urges "That the English Parliament as well as the nobility and gentry of England, be forbidden to interfere in any way in their assemblies (*comitiis*) or elsewhere in this case of the said matrimony." There is not a word about the state of English feeling, or a suggestion of English indignation. Pollard has used the reference as a peg for his own opinion; and Constant, most unfortunately, has given that opinion as a fact. Moreover, his second reference is not *ad rem*. It is a letter to Henry from Montaborinus dated 16th February, 1534—months after Henry's marriage with Anne.

(b) On p. 8 Constant says that the excommunication of Henry passed almost unnoticed, and that the king

¹⁶ Cf. *Catholic Encyclopædia*, Vol. XV, s.v. Warham; and Constant's references in n. 60.

made as great cheer as ever. His references are mixed—one to the divorce decision, the other to the excommunication. (See Pollard, pp. 307, 321). Pollard has, it seems to me, distorted the evidence as given in *L. and P.*, VII, 469. Chapuys goes on to say that Henry's "good cheer" was really bluff, and adds that "his spirit is not at rest," and that he has ordered the Easter preachers to say the worst they possibly can against the Pope. I cannot believe that Constant would have followed Pollard had he read the original.

(c) The crucial text on the divorce date question—Vetor Lippomano's letter in 1514—is quoted with a slight inaccuracy by Constant. Between the two sentences of the quotation in Pollard, p. 176, there is the usual typographical device to indicate a break in the quotation. . . . This is not given by Constant, p. 43. Yet in the original printed authority sixteen lines separate the two sentences. The letter is taken from *Sanuto Diaries*, V, xix., p. 1. Perhaps the most amusing reference in the whole book is in this note 34. It is to Belloc's *Wolsey*, n. H.—which is a refutation of Pollard! This reference was not, of course, in the French edition, which was published before Belloc's book appeared.

(d) Constant, p. 51, n. 61, gives a list—incomplete—of the children born to Catherine. The reference to the first of these is completely wrong. It should be *Sp. Cal.*, II, Pref., p. xiv., No. 8, and has nothing to do with the still-born daughter. See *P.*, p. 174, nn. 2 and 5. Constant adds that on January 1st, 1511, she gave birth to a son, the Prince of Wales, who lived only *three days*. This is followed by an array of references: *Ven. Cal.*, II, 95, 96; *L. and P.*, I, 1491, 1495; II, 4692.

Pollard, p. 175, says that on the 1st January, 1511, she was delivered of her first-born son, and gives references: *Ven. Cal.*, II, 95-96; *L. and P.*, Vol. I, 1491, 1495, 1513, Pref., p. lxxiii.; II, 4692. He then goes on to say that the child was the subject of great rejoicing and was "given a serjeant-at-arms on the 14th, a clerk of the signet on the 19th of February. *Three days* later he was dead." The references given are as follows: *Ven. Cal.*, II, 95, refers to the birth of a son to the King "on New Year's Day, one hour and a half after midnight, and was christened on the following Sunday, the 5th, with very great pomp and rejoicing." The next

document, II, 96, is merely a decision of the Venetian Doge and Senate to send letters of congratulation to the King of England on the birth of his son. It is dated by the editor March 5th.

The references in *L. and P.*, Vol. I, are: (i.) to a tourney on the birth of a prince (No. 1491: Articles of the challenge of the four knights, dated 12th February); (ii.) a Patent under the Privy Seal to Thomas Cordray "to be serjeant-at-arms to the King's first-born, Henry Prince of Wales, with 12^d a day," dated 14th February (No. 1495); (iii.) a Patent under the Privy Seal to Henry Knight "to be clerk of the signet to the Prince of Wales," dated 19th February, delivered 21st February (No. 1513); (iv.) to the child's death. "But the bright vision faded almost as soon as the pageant itself. On February 22nd this desire of all eyes died" (Preface, p. lxxiii.). It is curious that of all these documents, the only one referring to the death of the child is *not* quoted by Constant, while the "three days" mentioned by Pollard is repeated. The reference II, 4692, moreover, has nothing to do with the subject. It is a letter from one Maurice Byrchynsha to Wolsey, and the "boy" referred to is certainly not the Prince. The reference may possibly be to 4279 or 4529, both of which refer to the Queen being with child, but in 1518. Pollard's reference is wrong, but it occurs in Constant.

(e) Constant, p. 45, n. 42, quotes *L. and P.*, I, 180, 233, 319, with regard to the Duke of Buckingham's succession. But 180 is a presentation to a chantry at Sheryvehoton; 233 is a *congé d'élire* to the sub-prior and convent of the Augustinian Priory of St. Mary, Buttley; and 319 is a Patent under the Privy Seal to Sir Robert Sheffield to be steward of Kyrton, in Lyndesey, Lincs. Pollard's reference (p. 182) to the claims of Buckingham in 1503 is *L. and P. of Richard III and Henry VII*, I, 233. I have not been able to verify this; but have also noticed in Pollard (p. 38) a reference to *L. and P.*, *Henry VII*, I, 180, 233, 319. There is also some confusion in the notes 104 and 105 on p. 26. The second should be V, 171, a long letter from Chapuys to Charles V occupying three pages in the original (pp. 83-85). The document quoted in n. 104 mentions, not Temse, but "two worthy men (*hommes de bien*)."
Again, on page 191 of *Henry VIII*, Dr. Pollard has given three references incor-

rectly—quoting the page instead of the number of the document. Two of these references appear with the same errors in the French edition of Constant's book (p. 347, n. 62, and p. 348, n. 64). In the English version one has been corrected, but the other remains.¹⁷

Pollard's references in any case present a certain number of difficulties. For *L. and P.* he quotes, as a rule, the number of the volume followed by that of the document. (On p. 141 the reference III, 306, is to the page. It occurs in C., p. 40, n. 19.) For the Venetian and Spanish Calendars he sometimes quotes the document and sometimes the page. Constant appears to adopt the same procedure with the identical documents—a most suggestive parallelism. Thus the references quoted by Constant, p. 43, n. 34; p. 20, n. 77; p. 45, n. 40; p. 21, n. 78; p. 41, n. 21, are document references, as they are in Pollard; while p. 4, n. 11; p. 5, n. 16; p. 40, n. 19; p. 46, n. 44; p. 54, n. 67 are page references. On p. 40 the reference to *Giustiniani's Despatches* is wrong, as it is in Pollard, p. 39. There is a peculiar mistake in the reference *Ven. Cal.*, Vol. I, 1529, on p. 56, n. 69. Pollard (p. 204), for once, has quoted *Ven. Cal.*, IV, by the year—1529—and then added 212, meaning the page. Constant has taken the 1529 as a document reference and has left out the page. I shall remark below on the references to Pollard's *Cranmer*.

These instances make it appear that for his facts M. Constant has relied more on Professor Pollard than on the original documents. This is a great compliment to the English historian, who is admittedly an unrivalled authority on the period. But it seems to me that even in his judgments on such important questions as Henry's own attitude to the breach with Rome, the constitutional issues, the financial and religious factors in the Reformation—matters in which "official" history is often at variance with a Catholic interpretation—the similarity of statement is too remarkable to give Constant's opinions a claim to independence. The case of Robert Aske

¹⁷ P. 49, n. 56, and p. 50, n. 58. I suspect that the correction was made by the Translator who consulted the document in order to give the original English. The text of *Ven. Cal.*, IV, 802 (p. 351), gives "con li capelli sparsi," but this is a minor point.

might be instanced, but the following are more specific examples:—

(a) Constant: . . . The breach with Rome was not in fact a spontaneous movement of the Church in England. It was not the rejection of a yoke which would have burdened it. In Convocation the Church adopted a purely defensive attitude. . . . The Reformation in England, then, was wrought by agreement, by the combined action of Parliament and the King, but Henry's was the larger share. It is true he did not create the factors of this religious revolution, but he used them with a coolness and calculation worthy of Machiavelli's *Prince* (pp. 32-33).¹⁹

Pollard: . . . It was not primarily a breach between the Church of England and the Roman Communion, a repudiation on the part of English ecclesiastics of a harassing papal yoke. . . . The breach with the Roman Church . . . was not a spontaneous clerical movement. The representatives of the clergy met, of course . . . but their attitude was purely defensive. . . . His passions were strong, but his self-control was stronger; and the breach with Rome was effected with a cold and calculated cunning which the most adept disciple of Machiavelli could not have excelled. He did not create the factors he used; hostility to the Church had a real objective existence (pp. 267, 268, 270, 272, 276).

(b) Constant: . . . Hence the historical importance of Henry VIII's divorce is not that it was one of the causes in itself, but that by converting into enmity a former friendship it alienated from Rome the only power capable of keeping together the forces that were working against the Church and tending to rend it asunder (p. 34).

Pollard: . . . but there never was a flimsier theory than that the divorce of Catherine was the sole cause of the break with Rome. The centrifugal forces were quite independent of the divorce; its historical importance lies in the fact that it alienated from Rome the only power in England which might have kept them in check (p. 238).

¹⁹ Fr. Hughes, in the *CLERGY REVIEW*, May, 1931, p. 545, was struck by this phrase; and by the judgment quoted in my following example. So also was J.J.D. in *The Tablet*, October 13th, 1934, p. 457.

(c) Constant: . . . Dogma, in fact, did not have the same share in the Reformation in England as did justification by faith in Germany, or predestination in Switzerland. Englishmen are not lovers of abstract ideas. Not being logical like the French, nor mystics like the Germans, they do not enter into theological quarrels; they are more for questions of a practical nature. So the Reformation began in England, not with the proclamation of some theological novelty, but rather with the destroying of the clergy's privileges and confiscation of the Church's property. The Reformation in this country was brought about solely by a grievance of a practical order intimately bound up with a question of money (p. 31).

Pollard: . . . Englishmen are singularly free from the bondage of abstract ideas, and they began their Reformation, not with the enunciation of some new truth, but with an attack on clerical fees. Reform was stimulated by a practical grievance, clearly connected with money, and not by a sense of wrong done to the conscience. No dogma plays such a part in the English Reformation as Justification by Faith did in Germany, or Predestination in Switzerland (p. 272).¹⁹

(d) Constant: . . . And by not keeping the monastic wealth in the Royal Treasury, Henry unwittingly saved

¹⁹ These passages bear careful comparison. It looks as though Constant has toned down Pollard's anti-Catholic terms (theological novelty=new truth), but I fear he has distorted the sense of Pollard's remark about dogma. In fact, Papal supremacy and the unity and indissolubility of marriage were doctrines involved in the Reformation in this country from the beginning. It was for these doctrines that the first Martyrs died. See the Preface to the third edition of Fr. Bridgett's *Blessed Thomas More*, with James Gairdner's letter of agreement. "Indirectly, as you say, he suffered for his faith in the supremacy of the Holy See. But if we take cognisance of a cause for which he 'indirectly' suffered, he also died to uphold the sanctity of marriage."

I think Pollard's judgment is truer than Constant's. The French text is: "Le dogme, en effet, ne joua point, dans la Réforme anglicane, le rôle de la justification par la foi, en Allemagne, ou la prédestination en Suisse." A correct rendering of Pollard would be: "Nul dogme n'a joué. . . ." Later in the book, however, Constant is quite clear on the question of these first martyrdoms. His Chapter V especially is an excellent summary.

England from the absolutism of the Stuarts, who, had they been rich, would have done without Parliament (p. 192).

Pollard: . . . from another [point of view] he saved England from a most serious danger. Had the Crown retained the wealth of the monasteries, the Stuarts might have made themselves independent of Parliament. But this service to liberty was not voluntary on Henry's part (p. 341).

(e) The opinions on pp. 1 and 141 look to me like whittlings down of Pollard's remarks on pp. 233 and 341. They cannot be called manifestly untrue; yet even as they stand there is a *suggestio falsi*. The first says that the Schism was but an episode in the eternal conflict between Church and State. An episode! Maitland's less anti-Catholic judgment called it a catastrophe, and that is not at all an exaggeration. If it was "but an episode" then there is a good deal to be said for Anglican "continuity". Pollard implies this in his next sentence when he speaks of "ancient royal prerogative," and the "usurped" power of the Pope. In the second case the remarks about monastic life and national particularism being in opposition are what one would expect from a non-Catholic. But M. Constant surely knows more about Religious Orders than that. In each case Pollard's opinion is exactly one of those examples of "official history"—a suggestion that the English nature was ill at ease under Catholicism—which Mr. Belloc summarized so ably in these pages last month. Again, Constant's judgment on p. 192 (n. 237) seems to be flatly contradictory to all that the author has previously said about Henry's relations with his Parliaments. Is it a quotation from a review? I feel the same about a good many of the criticisms of more recently published books. See, for example, the *English Historical Review*, January, 1931, pp. 161-162, and the excellent *comptes rendus* in the *Revue Historique*.

Pollard's works have received liberal acknowledgment from M. Constant throughout the book. Yet there are surprisingly few references to *Henry VIII*.²⁰ It is

²⁰ About ten, I think: pp. 31, n. 128; 41, n. 24; 71, n. 128; 84, n. 177; 91, n. 2; 173, n. 157; 193, n. 239; 145, n. 34; 337, n. 175. They deal mainly with details. Thus the second is used to justify the statement that Henry was a good dancer. Several are omitted in the Index.

mentioned in the Bibliography for Chapter I (p. 441), but not in that for Chapter II. About the bibliography itself I am even a little doubtful. Pp. 440-41 should be compared with the whole of Pollard's Preface, though the "million facts" which both mention do not refer to exactly the same documents. Again, Brewer's *Reign of Henry VIII* is simply his collected prefaces from the *L. and P.* series, edited by James Gairdner. Constant does not seem to realize this (p. 451, end of Bibliography [A]). Again, it seems that the note on Polydore Vergil (p. 42) is a bad arrangement of the note on n. 486 of Fisher, *Political History*, Vol. V. I think that the French edition showed even closer bibliographical affinity. Thus p. 340, n. 36, looked to be a re-arrangement of Pollard's note on p. 198, with two incorrect references and a very erroneous attribution. This paragraph does not appear in the English edition.

I think there can be no doubt about the value of M. Constant's book; it is bound to rank as a standard work. The notes alone make it indispensable to students. They are a bibliographical *tour de force* and a mine of information, especially with regard to recent works. Biographies of some of the principal characters, and special studies of different aspects of the Reformation have appeared in recent years, but no general history on such a scale has been attempted since Canon Dixon's history, which seems nowadays so very ancient. In such a vast work there must be a great deal of dependence on the researches and studies of others, yet it is inevitably bound to take away from the authority of the writer, especially when a Catholic makes such use of non-Catholic works and non-Catholic or anti-Catholic estimates on disputed points. This seems to me to be a fault in the earlier part of Constant's book. I am sorry, too, that there is evidence of the same sort in later pages. At least there are passages on pp. 149, 150 and 151 which read very much like Pollard, pp. 341 and 342. The notes 65 and 66 on p. 152 seem to contain a good deal of Gasquet, *Henry the Eighth and the English Monasteries* (seventh edition, 1920), p. 98, and there are later passages similar to parts of Pollard's *Cranmer*: e.g., C. p. 376, n. 126, and P. p. 167, n. 1; C. p. 380 and P. pp. 135-136; C. p. 338, n. 177, and P. p. 156, n. 1. But both these

authorities are liberally acknowledged in other parts of the work.²¹

Both the English and French versions of Constant's book were, with a few exceptions, very favourably reviewed by most of the English Catholic Press. Among the dissentient voices was a very strong criticism by Dr. Messenger in the *CLERGY REVIEW*, October, 1934, of the author's opinion with regard to the doctrinal position of the "Henrician Church." An unsigned review in *Catholic Book Notes* (November-December, 1934) denied the historical value of the first chapter of the book, declaring that it was "far too sweeping," and asking that it be revised. A review of the French edition in *Studies*, March, 1931, maintained that the early part of the book was "exaggerated." It seems to me that these opinions are fairly just; and that the source of the exaggeration is to be found in Pollard's work.

I am convinced that the book is a very able synthesis, and as such is a valuable contribution to history. But personal examination makes me tolerably sure that M. Constant has not "dug his way, carefully sifting and sieving his find, through the whole of the bibliography, sources and works alike, of one of the most copiously documented subjects in our history." I cannot believe that the work places him "in a class, where, hitherto, Lingard alone of Catholic scholars has found a place." I do not think it is "the most scientific Catholic work on the English Reformation." Nor does it seem to me that "as a monument of scholarly research the

²¹ The reference on p. 376 is curious. It is given as *L. and P.*, 1542, No. 176. In nearly every other case Constant refers to *L. and P.* by the volume (for 1542 it would be XVII). Pollard's reference is also *L. and P.*, 1542, No. 176 but this method of reference occurs frequently in his *Cranmer*. Even the quotation is rather odd. (It deals with the revision of the Bible in 1542.) Pollard's text is almost verbatim an extract from *L. and P.*, with his own comment following it: "The bishops all protested . . . that Convocation was better fitted for the task than the universities, i.e., that the voice of authority should prevail over that of learning." Constant's note includes both the original and Pollard's comment, with a changed word which completely alters the sense: ". . . than the universities, i.e., that truth should prevail over learning" Nobody will deny that Pollard's *Cranmer* is anti-Catholic. It is published in a *Heroes of the Reformation* series!

book stands almost alone." I have, moreover, too high an opinion of French historical scholarship to agree with the judgment with which Mr. Belloc concludes his Preface. M. Constant must have a magnificent card-index or *système des fiches*; I feel sure he has been able to consult a very full library catalogue; it looks as though he has made good use of extracts from a number of historical reviews and periodicals; but I cannot feel with any confidence that he has for the early chapters of his book consulted the original documents. Father Hughes suggests that the discussions which the book will provoke will leave us a little less contented with what only too often has done duty among us for historical scholarship. I find it hard to agree with him, and I feel sure that if the author had made use of the first edition of Professor Pollard's book in which there were no references, the voluminous notes and copious documentation, at least in the earlier part of his book, would have been far less imposing.

The state of the question then seems, at the present and until new evidence, if any, is produced, to be this: There was a third-hand rumour in Rome in 1514 that Henry was going to repudiate his wife, and there exists a reference in a catalogue to a letter dealing with an unspecified nullity case, or possibly with several cases (*matrimoniis*), probably in England, in 1514. One must agree that the first seems "quite insufficient," while the second may have nothing at all to do with Henry's divorce. It might, for instance, refer either to Charles Brandon and Mary Tudor, or possibly, if the date were wrong, to Margaret's divorce from her husband, Angus (Pollard, p. 200). One of the references which used to be accepted as dealing with Henry's divorce in 1526,²² has been referred at different times to two other cases. *Ab esse ad posse valet illatio!*

²² Clerk's letter to Wolsey referring to "istud benedictum divortium." *L. and P.*, IV, 2482: Even now it is doubtful what divorce Clerk had in mind. Brewer thought he referred to Henry's; Dr. Ehses, followed by J. Gairdner (*E.H.R.*, October, 1896, p. 676), held that the letter referred to a divorce for Francis, to free himself from his proxy marriage with the Emperor's sister Eleanor. This opinion was followed by Pollard in his *Henry VIII*, even in the 1930 impression (p. 197, n. 1). Friedmann, according to Belloc, thought that it "clearly" referred to the pending divorce between Margaret of Scotland

It seems impossible therefore to admit the 1514 divorce project as an "accepted fact." Mr. Belloc has a great deal of sound historical backing for his characteristic statement that "Anne Boleyn at the origin of the divorce is as glaring a truth as you can find in the history of Europe."²³ The evidence is not absolutely convincing. (If it were, there would be no dispute.) But it seems very strong, and, in default of any fresh evidence, Belloc's must be accepted as the more likely opinion. Whether Professor Pollard's plea for the 1514 project is inspired by anti-Catholic prejudice, as Belloc maintains, is a question which that learned author alone could answer. The possibility cannot by any means be ruled out.

On larger issues several conclusions suggest themselves. We can sometimes be too sweeping in our condemnation of "official" history. A very great deal of sound historical work is being done by non-Catholics; and in most cases they have been genuinely pursuing historical truth. Pollard's book was written thirty-two years ago, yet Pollard's facts and even Pollard's judgments—tempered and re-arranged, it is true—produced almost a literary sensation among Catholics last July. Yet facts are neither "Catholic" nor "non-Catholic"; they speak for nobody but themselves. And we can be thankful that such an industrious, learned and accurate historian as Professor Pollard has supplied us with so much evidence on the Tudor period. When we have mastered the facts we can form our judgments and interpretations of them; and we can criticize the judgments and interpretations of others. But will these judgments ever be final? In the prefaces to their books, the leaders of this debate have each laid down a principle. Belloc has written: "Judgment is the essence of history. If the picture rendered leaves many essentials out of place or inexplicable, judgment has been at fault, and the consonance or

and Angus. In his *Wolsey*, however, "for reasons too long to state," Pollard returns to the view "that Brewer was right." Belloc follows this opinion (*History of England*, Vol IV, p. 65, n. 1; *Wolsey*, p. 219).

²³ *Universe*, November 16th, 1934. Cf. *ibid.*, December 14th, 1934.

dissonance of his statements with what we know of human nature is the test of an historian." Yet his adversary maintains: "Dogmatism is merely the result of ignorance; and no honest historian will pretend to have mastered all the facts, accurately weighed all the evidence, or pronounced a final judgment." Are these positions irreconcilable?

Finally, it is well to take Mr. Belloc's teaching to heart. Time and again has he denied the value of footnotes and "pedantic appendages" as enhancing the authority of an historian. We should not be misled by the "apparatus" of learning, but should examine the learning itself. And that we can do successfully only when we have mastered the evidence.

AFTER THE EUCHARISTIC CONGRESS

BY THE REV. C. C. MARTINDALE, S.J.

CHILDREN often have the trying habit of asking, when you have finished a story: "And *then* what happened?" But an event like a Eucharistic Congress is a definite challenge to anyone, who has not merely contemplated its pageantry and exulted in its triumphs, to ask himself: "What should we do *next*?" The recent Congress at Buenos Aires, far from being an exception, provoked this question with unusual frequency and urgency. For example, I think that the Congress at Carthage in 1930 did not cause Catholics to look forward, so much as back—towards St. Augustine and SS. Perpetua and Felicitas and the other martyrs on the site of whose long-ago passion so much of the Congress was actually held. No doubt developments in the matter of African missionary-work were discussed, but on the whole the Congress was commemorative rather than meant to be creative. The Buenos Aires Congress seems to me destined to be just the opposite.

No one was more disconcerted by the Congress than the Argentines themselves, and in what follows I try to use only Argentine opinions as I heard them vigorously and often expressed, and to add but few tentative surmises of my own. A small point is symptomatic. For a year before the Congress, we had been having it said: "You cannot expect such orderliness amongst us, as you got in Dublin or Sydney." But the order was perfect—as good as anywhere. Even, in my train to Mendoza afterwards, which had a throng of Chilean pilgrims on it, the guard exclaimed that he had never seen such a crowd—"They wait—they ask—they obey!" But the supreme astonishment was the number of men present during the midnight procession to the Plaza Mayo where four Masses were celebrated and Communion given. I was told that 40,000 particles had been consecrated in the Cathedral; but it was reckoned that 400,000 men demanded the Sacraments: since Masses were said continuously as from midnight, sufficient could be provided, and communions were being given all the way up to Plaza del Congreso where the procession

started, nor were they finished when the dawn began to break. Moreover, men in great numbers broke through the cordons of auxiliary police and went to confession wherever they saw a priest, in connection with which very amusing incidents took place. This procession therefore became called the Funeral March of Human Respect. This implied that men had been prevented from using the Sacraments out of human respect, and left them entirely to women. But other reasons were alleged for their discarding the Sacraments "directly they left school"—and, after all, if you suffer from human respect, you must be humanly-respecting someone or something; it is unlikely you will all be intimidated merely of one another, and that without cause. Evidently a *tradition* of not going to the Sacraments had been set up.

Let me eliminate one category—those who live at enormous distances from priests, lost in the "camp," i.e., the bush or veldt, as it would be called elsewhere. Priests are far too few to reach all these save very seldom; the construction, this very year (1934), of five archbishoprics and a number of new dioceses (nine, I think) completes ecclesiastical organization but does not of itself multiply the clergy: and such camp-dwellers, if at intervals they visit towns, are more likely to accumulate matter for confession than to confess it.¹

To put the matter crudely, I was told (this applies by no means only to the Argentine): "We have a bad tradition as to morals. It has been accepted that men openly have mistresses: their sons know it and imitate them so far as they can and so soon as possible: hence neither fathers nor sons *can* go to the Sacraments, and since their women-folk do, religion is seen as proper to them only." Unnecessary to hark back to the causes of this alleged unhappy state of things, for there are grounds for optimism. One is, the passion for athletics

¹ It was unexpected to have to explain to Argentines that even tiny England has its distances and empty spaces, which provide a problem. Once convinced of this, they were very anxious to know how we dealt with them. Motor cars? "Gyratory" priests? The Roman Campagna itself used to have the same problem though on a smaller scale than the Argentine, which, we must remember, has very bad secondary roads, often impassable even for a horse.

that has beset the Latin countries. Obviously, by themselves athletics do not moralize; but they provide an interest, for thought and talk; an outlet for energy; a motive for keeping fit; and the chance of a better-balanced body-soul. The Church is not allowing this opportunity to slip. Cardinal Pacelli opened an "Ateneo" for young men, which caters fully for sport; and in Rome he blessed the sports-club built for ecclesiastical students by the Knights of St. Columba. Hence I cannot be naïf in hoping that the Latin clergy themselves will develop the habit of hard exercise, of which the Holy Father and Cardinal Merry del Val, after all, have set a brilliant example. I recur below to this point about the clergy.

Another encouraging fact at the Congress was the spontaneous emergence of University students, many of them medical, and of professors, asserting their solidarity with the ideals of Congress. I know that there was a small minority who published a flying-sheet called "Insurrexit" (a parody of "Resurrexit") denouncing the Congress; that an old-fashioned "liberalism" still survives in "intellectual" circles; and that Russian propagandists enter the universities in order to disseminate subversive ideas, and even "double" a year so as to have longer in which to do so. But undoubtedly it will be much harder, since the Congress, to assert that religion and intelligence are divorced; and if, as we may hope, a tremendous *instructional campaign*—from simple catechism up to higher Catholic education of university standard—be one of the fruits of the Congress, a great development of varied intellectual interests and a corresponding multiplication of well-written Catholic books may be looked for; and, again, though knowledge and interests do not of themselves moralize, the mind will be more fully, and more nobly, occupied. It would take too long to describe the vast change beginning to occur in the education of girls, and their new outlook as to marriage itself: the terrible dangers attending an abrupt unprepared untended emancipation of girls are patent—were the Church to neglect this phenomenon, almost any disaster might be looked for. But I do not think her clergy are doing so at all, though I could not see as much of convent education as I should have liked. Still, what I did see, was on the encouraging side. In

proportion, then, as women become looked on less as toys or the necessary instrument for producing a family, they will both respect themselves and be respected the more, be true companions, and eliminate the so-called "necessity" of seeking a supplement.

Two other points. The life of the modern Argentine has been a commercial one—in a sense, such has always been its history. Spain neglected this possession because it produced but little precious metal or gems: but cattle and wheat—these it has always been concerned with. Hence, roughly, it became a place where men meant to make their fortunes, and often expected to get back to Europe so soon as they had made them. This does not lead to business-honesty nor concern for the well-being of society; and the gulf between rich and poor, not least in Chile, was far too noticeable and tragic. Someone said to me: "This has been a land where the one aim of life was, to fill your personal pocket." I can hardly judge of the truth of that; but one sees how easily it could happen. The second point is an extension of this. Where money-making is the main object, politics will be corrupt: positions will be bought by bribes, and maintained by favouritizing. The politics of Latin republics have been a by-word for corruption, though we ought to emphasize that so have those of North America and of too many a European country; and our own local politics (to stick to those) are often provocative of one's disgust, contempt and indignation. It remains that if politicians *are* corrupt, the more completely the Church is disentangled from them the better, though the more urgent becomes the need of decent laymen as legislators and officials. But whatever may have been true for the past, a conscience is certainly awakened now, and it was easy to see that laymen were concerned about social injustice, and quite alert to the abomination of political jobbery.

Hereupon, two questions arose, each of the utmost delicacy. The first was, would it be better for the Church to be disconnected from the State? The second was, had the Church lost contact with the people? We need not repeat the normal Catholic doctrine about the relation between Church and State in an ideal society: the point is, no "societies" are to-day ideal, and the tradition, or background, of South American republics

(true, the Argentine is the least "South American" part—the most Latin-European with a strong admixture of non-Latins—of South America), may be such as to unfit them for very close association with the Church. To put it very sketchily—in Spain, Portugal and Austria, the Church seems to me to have been subject to the State rather than allied with it. Take but two examples. When the State gives, or ensures, salaries and pensions to the clergy, the clergy at once *looks as if* it were merely part of the civil service, and priests themselves may feel afraid of criticizing what gives them their livelihood. Moreover, when great prelates in such societies have enormous revenues from lands (which require to be managed by lay agents very difficult to supervise), not only the national church is run by means of subsidies rather than by all-round contribution, but, the clergy seem, and indeed are, knit up with one definite social system, and if the system collapses, the Church tends to do likewise. This was put to me very clearly by, for example, the late Cardinal Czernoch, primate of Hungary, who deplored his own personal situation, and that of the ruined Hungarian church.

But in the South American republics there are always "parties" (or hitherto have been) so violently opposed to one another, that to receive benefits from one is practically to court the opposition of the other. Moreover, there is always one party which is explicitly anti-clerical, so that it regards the Church as its enemy even when the Church has not been allied with some other party which it may oust. It is, then, not impossible, but difficult for the Church to be allied with the State there, without seeming to be allied with a *party*, outside and above all of which she should be *seen* to remain. Everyone knows, also, how difficult it has been (say, in Chile) for the Church to do as she wished in regard not only of episcopal appointments, but of subdivision of dioceses and even parishes. The separation between Church and State was engineered in Chile, unless I err, in a pacific way, and a wholesale rearrangement of dioceses and parishes followed: the financial loss was considerable, mainly because the faithful had never thought they needed to support their pastors, whom the Government was paying, and had to be taught why and how they should do so. I actually found

myself speculating then, after this procession of the Blessed Sacrament in which the President and his government took official part, acclaimed with *Vivas* as loud as those which saluted the Blessed Sacrament, whether it might be better in the long run amicably to loosen the bonds between Church and State, before they were rudely snapped by revolution—a possibility we have always to envisage, though the Argentine has been relatively peaceful, and has had no war, I think, since 1870.

Finally, it was urged by some that while Church and State had been united, Church and People had got out of contact. The Congress proved that the Faith existed very strongly in the Argentine; an uninstructed Faith, may be; but still, the people was religious, if not ecclesiastically so. This is always possible, and at times the clergy can almost deliberately dissociate themselves from new movements which need not be suspected. Thus I remember very well how sneered at were athletics both in Italy and France, say, thirty years ago. Coming from England, they were thought to be "Protestant," and a cult of the body—de-supernaturalizing, if not demoralizing. It was in the nature of things that nuns, educated in one way, should feel at least puzzled, if not shocked, by the modern girl's new exigencies. Everyone knows how pious literature used to have a style of its own, which made it seem quite unnatural. Such problems will no doubt recur; and the Church's representatives are rightly slow in their action. But even slowness implies movement: perhaps there have been countries where they did not move at all. Well, the Cardinal Legate flew about over Buenos Aires for twenty minutes, and that was a sort of symbol.

Our problem really extends much further than the Argentine. In England, the average man cannot discriminate much between parsons and priests—perhaps he knows enough to admit that the latter are the easier to get on with. But *he has ceased to believe in parsons*. In his heart he does not see why there should be any. Other men are those who do the jobs of the world. Perhaps in all countries, contact has, in various ways been lost. But it is the average man who counts. Put not your trust in princes. We have to build from bottom upwards.

PEDANTRY AND THE CHANT

BY HERBERT ANTCLIFFE, F.R.S.A.

"**M**ISSA DE ANGELIS," said a recent writer in a Church newspaper on the Continent, "is not an easy Mass to sing, and cannot be sung by the populace." His reason for saying this was that he considered the work too full of delicate rhythmic nuances for anyone except trained singers under a first-class conductor. This is one, perhaps extreme, instance among many which exist to-day of a kind of pedantry which is hindering the carrying out of the explicit instructions given by Pope Pius X and his successor as well as by many of his predecessors. It is like the refusal of many choirmasters and organists to allow the faithful to sing, or at least to assist them in their singing of "Veni, Creator Spiritus" or the "Te Deum Laudamus" on the ground that they must be sung with certain very subtle nuances of rhythm and dynamics and, if accompanied on the organ, accompanied very lightly and without any suggestion of a lead to the singing of them by large bodies of people. Not very long ago an American priest on a visit to Europe called on me with the object of talking over Church music with a view to establishing relations between Europe and America. Inevitably we got on to the subject of Gregorian Music, when he expressed the opinion (or, judging by his manner, laid down the law) to the effect that such music was never intended to be sung by the people and was entirely unsuitable for their singing. It never occurred to him, and he would not admit it when I pointed it out to him, that he was opposing his opinion to the rule of several Popes and to the considered opinions of their learned advisers.

Even looking at the matter from the historical point of view and referring back to the early days of the Chant, before choral singing on the part of the great masses of the people was so general as it is to-day, do we really think that St. Gregory, and his friends from Greece and Spain, SS. Eulogios and Leander, were concerned only in getting together music that could be sung by a few trained singers? One of the chief objects of St. Gregory was to restrain the vanity of the singers and to put them in their place as leaders of the singing of the faithful and not as "artists" out to display their fine voices and skill at using them. Much of the Chant also was composed to rhymed verses which were introduced into the Liturgy for the purpose of making the part of the faithful easier than is the case with prose words. That various abuses arose with the passage of time, which authority had to suppress, is no answer. The one way to prevent them arising again is to see that all

Catholics are reasonably instructed in the Liturgy and realize their responsibilities in regard to it.

Another line which is taken by some who desire to prevent the use of the Chant is that it is an archaic form of music comparable to the old languages; a fine and interesting, and in some cases useful, study, but not a matter of present-day practice. "Imagine," says a devout Catholic and capable musician, "that I am asked to speak in the language of centuries ago and not in the language of to-day! Who would understand me? Everybody would think I was mentally afflicted!" And, basing an argument on this, he objects to being asked to sing or to listen to music of a remote period. He forgets that not only in the Latin of the Church, and of the Courts of Law, he hears and uses what is a not very remote development of the language of these early periods, but his own language is not so very far removed from that of centuries ago. Moreover, he does not object to the music of Handel and Bach, which many modern musicians find more out of date than they find Gregorian music or that of the intervening periods between St. Gregory and these two giants of the eighteenth century. Most Englishmen think they speak the language of Shakespeare, when really they are speaking something that is a modification of such language. And when our choral societies sing "Messiah" or the Christmas Oratorio they are singing what is just as much a modification of the music as of the language. Such a person, therefore, in trying to be unpedantic, is joining forces with the "purists" and wanting to make the Chant a dead subject instead of a living means of expression.

But the expression of our highest thoughts and aspirations is naturally somewhat different from that which we use for our material needs and towards our fellow creatures in our daily round of bread-winning and relaxation from that occupation. Which of us, even in our most intimate and impromptu private prayers, uses the same forms of expression as we use in our intercourse in office and home? And when we join in the collective expression of public worship in the Mass or the Offices, or even in devotions such as Benediction or the Holy Hour, we use a still more formal and less banal language. And so it is with our music. It is not necessarily all even based on the ancient material or style, but in its dignity it must bear some close relation to that. And while the old music is essentially the same as it was fifteen centuries ago it has undergone such slight development as makes it eminently suited to the needs of choir and congregation each in the sphere allotted to it. And while knowledge (of which in this matter a little is particularly dangerous) is necessary, still more necessary is the goodwill which allows of the proper use of such knowledge.

HOMILETICS

BY THE RIGHT REV. ABBOT VONIER, O.S.B.,
Abbot of Buckfast.

Passion Sunday: April 7th.

"They took up stones therefore to cast at him. But Jesus hid himself and went out of the temple" (John viii. 59).

At the opening of Passiontide we may well ask ourselves what were the predominant feelings of Christ during the days of the great expectation, when He was waiting for the hour that would see Him delivered up to His enemies. It was, I think, an overpowering sense of the hatred of those very enemies. For we must always bear in mind that Our Lord's death was essentially and exclusively the result of human hatred, of man's enmity. Our Lord did not, and in fact could not, die what is called a natural death: He could not die of disease or old age. But He could have died from many violent causes, He could have been the victim of an accident if He had so willed it, and His death, thus accidental, could have been made the world's redemption. He could have been one of those Galileans "whose blood Pilate had mingled with their sacrifices," as related by St. Luke (Luke xiii. 1). He could have been made the victim of some political outrage on the part of the Romans, as was too frequently the case. His blood, in whatever way it was split, would have raised to heaven a cry infinitely more piercing than the cry of Abel's blood. It would have rent asunder the wall of separation between God and man, even if it had been poured out by the hands of a robber on the way from Jericho to Jerusalem. But it was pre-ordained by God that His beloved Son should be put to death through the sheer hatred and enmity of man.

This is an all-important circumstance in the mystery of the death of Christ. The wicked disposition of the will of His enemies, rejoicing in His apparent impotence, in the seeming abandonment by God of His Son, makes of the death of Jesus something very terrible; they said indeed, in their moment of triumph when they saw Him expire on the Cross: "We have swallowed Him up." What the Psalmist considered as the greatest misfortune had come upon Our Lord: "Judge me, O Lord my God, according to Thy justice, and let them not rejoice over me. Let them not say in their hearts: It is well, it is well to our mind: neither let them say: We have swallowed him up" (Psalm xxxiv. 24, 25).

When, therefore, we ask ourselves the question what Our Lord's feelings were during the weeks that preceded the great day of His Passion, we cannot omit from the mental picture of

His sweet soul a great dread of the perverseness of His enemies. He saw how they were becoming more implacable every day; His eyes looked on their hard faces, whilst His mind plunged deep down into their secret thoughts. It was an antagonism of mind and soul such as the world had never known: it was not hatred pitted against hatred, jealousy pitted against jealousy, for all the dark passions were on the side of the enemies; it was satanic hardness pitted against divine meekness, bitterest jealousy against infinite liberality of disposition, tortuous mendacity against the uprightness of the eternal Word. And Christ's soul suffered keenly—who can say how keenly?—from this terrible opposition. The cold iron had entered deeply into Him. The Psalms and the Gospels are full of the signs of that dread, I might almost say, of that recoil of Christ's soul before the dark and angry faces of His malignant enemies. The Liturgy, too, of these sacred days seems chiefly arrested by this grave dread of the Son of God: "Save me from the lion's mouth and my lowness from the horns of the unicorns" is a constant invocation in the Divine Office; it is the prayer of Christ. Other no less poignant cries are frequently repeated: "Deliver, O God, my soul from the sword: my only one from the hand of the dog." "Deliver me, O Lord, from the evil man: rescue me from the unjust man" (Psalms xxi. and cxxxix.).

The power of man as an evil agency stands exposed naked, in all its hideousness, in the Gospel. There can be no doubt about it. It is no mere misunderstanding, mere friction, what might be termed mere incompatibility. No, it is hostility, pure and naked. It is one of the great truths to learn from the Scriptures, chiefly from the Gospels, that there is such a thing as man's hatred for his fellow man.

Some may say that there is no need for the Law and the Prophets to teach man's hatred for man: there is ample practical evidence without that. Unfortunately this is true. It is one of the experiences of life that man does hate his fellow man: that man can be man's worst enemy, that he is, in many instances, an evil being, that he can actually become the most terrible of malign forces. No lions or tigers or snakes or dragons can be such a danger to man as man himself may be at times.

But it is a great clearing up of moral difficulties, a strength and consolation to know that the holy men of the past, and more still, that the holiest of the sons of men, the Son of God Himself, has frankly admitted this fact. He never shuts His eyes to it; He speaks of it boldly, as boldly as did David in the Psalms. He knows His enemies and they want to kill Him; they may deny any such intention but He knows them better than they know themselves: "Why seek you to kill me? The multitude answered and said: Thou hast a devil: who seeketh to kill thee?" (John viii. 20). It is a hatred, not of misunderstanding but of perverseness: "If I had not done among them the works that no other man hath done, they would not have

sin : but now they have both seen and hated both Me and My Father. But that the word may be fulfilled which is written in their law : They have hated me without cause " (John xv. 24, 25). " They have both seen and hated " ! It is not a hatred of misunderstanding, but a hatred of understanding ; not a hatred of blindness but a hatred in light.

Once more I say that the bold acceptance by Our Lord of such a fact makes it easier for us to steer our course. The charity of Christ is not an unreasoning softheartedness, it is the imitation of His life and of every detail of that life. We are not bidden to ignore the existence of evil, to shut our eyes to it. On the contrary, we are bidden to face it bravely. We simply have to take it for granted that often we may be the object of real hatred and enmity. We are bidden to pray for our enemies and this very precept implies the realization of the fact that people are our enemies and carries with it the appreciation of the larger fact that man is man's worst evil.

Palm Sunday: April 14th.

" Now all this was done that it might be fulfilled which was spoken by the prophets " (Matt. xxi. 4, Gospel of Blessing of Palms).

It has always been the desire of Christ's friends to be able to penetrate into the thoughts and feelings of the Son of God when He found Himself getting nearer and nearer to His great day, the day of redemption. Repeatedly we are assured by His own words that He knew all that was coming ; He foresaw the tragedy that was impending to the last detail.

No man knows his future so clearly. Even then when the Holy Ghost reveals persecutions He does not show all their circumstances nor the final working out of things. " Behold, being bound in the spirit, I go to Jerusalem : not knowing the things which shall befall me there ; save that the Holy Ghost in every city witnesseth to me, saying : That bands and afflictions wait for me at Jerusalem. But I fear none of these things " (Acts xx. 22, 23).

How different this from the certainty of Christ's attitude : " Behold we go up to Jerusalem, and the Son of man shall be betrayed to the chief priests and the scribes : and they shall condemn Him to death. And shall deliver Him to the Gentiles to be mocked and scourged and crucified : and the third day He shall rise again " (Matt. xx. 18, 19). Why this difference ? Is it only because of Christ's omniscience ? There is more than all fullness of knowledge. Even supposing He had not known all things in the fullness of the Spirit, He would still have been shown the whole series of events by the Father, because for Him the great struggle about to begin was more than a fight against evil, a grappling with terrible difficulties : for Him the Passion was essentially a sacrifice, the details of the Passion were like so many rites of the sacrifice ; He is the High Priest

immolating His own body. Now if a priest has to know anything, the rite of his sacrifice is the first lesson he must learn.

St. Paul struggles like a brave soldier with the heroic uncertainty of the contest. "But I fear none of these things, neither do I count my life more precious than myself, so that I may consummate my course and the ministry of the word which I received from the Lord Jesus, to testify the gospel of the grace of God" (Acts xx. 24).

Christ has no uncertainties; He steps forth with the assurance of the priest at the altar, who has known his part for a long time: "Jesus, therefore, knowing all things that should come upon him, went forth and said to them: Whom seek ye?" (John xviii. 4).

So we have in Our Lord a quite dissimilar state of mind from the mentalities of the ordinary human hero. A sacrifice is something so unlike a battle. Unless we bear in mind how very different Our Lord was from us, through His perfection of sanctity, we are in danger of reading into Him feelings which belong to the fallen, pusillanimous, sickly natures such as ours, with the terrors of unruly imaginations and the timidities of weak wills. Thus we must welcome every indication in the Gospels which guides us to an understanding of Christ's interior dispositions at that supreme moment of His life. Truly in so mysterious a thing as Christ's feelings the Gospel is our only guide.

The most pronounced feature, then, of Christ's mental attitude is the desire to accomplish His great work of dying: "And he said to them: With desire I have desired to eat this pasch with you, before I suffer. For I say to you that from this time I will not eat it, till it be fulfilled in the kingdom of God" (Luke xxii. 15, 16). To eat this great pasch included His suffering, because He would give them His Body to eat, for it is His Body that is "given" for them on the Cross. His desire for the Last Supper is a desire for the whole great act of giving His Blood: "I have a baptism wherewith I am to be baptized. And how am I straitened until it be accomplished" (Luke xii. 50). It is a rite, the pouring out of His Blood.

The second sentiment of which the Gospel gives us a clear indication is fear: "Now is my soul troubled. And what shall I say? Father, save me from this hour?" (John xii. 27). The agony is all fear. How are we to reconcile the two apparently contradictory things? Our Lord does it for us: "*Spiritus quidem promptus est, caro autem infirma*" (Matt. xxvi. 41). The spirit is willing, with an immense will; but nothing could take away from the flesh the dread of death. Christ's terror is not the fear of the unknown: it is the clear vision of all that is going to happen to Him. The merit of His Passion is this, that He accepted everything the Father had decreed from all eternity. This is one of the characteristics of the Gospel narratives of Christ's Passion and Death; the Evangelists repeatedly insist

on the fact that all had been foretold prophetically: "Now all this was done that it might be fulfilled which was spoken by the prophets."

Let us during these coming days enter wholeheartedly into the remembrance of the divine tragedy of the Cross, but let us never lose sight of the supreme mystery that the Son is being immolated as Victim to the Father on the altar of the Cross, and that He Himself is not only the Victim but also the High Priest of that adorable sacrifice.

Easter Sunday: April 21st.

"And they said one to another: Who shall roll us back the stone from the door of the sepulchre?" (Mark xvi. 3).

In every great event there are two things that are worthy of attention. First there is the nature of the event, its time, its place, its joyful or sorrowful character: then there is the attitude of the human beings amongst whom the event has taken place. What did people feel when they saw it or heard of it? How did they look on the event, how did it affect them? This second thing, the attitude of the witnesses to the event, is often of no smaller interest than the nature of the event itself. Thus, in time of war, an observant mind will find it as absorbing to watch the behaviour of the civilian population with regard to the real war events, the battles, as to observe those battles themselves. Not to take account of the impressions made by the event, but simply to register an event in the long catalogue of facts would be a very imperfect realization of the march of human things.

Our Lord's Resurrection is the greatest event in human history. It is the triumph of life over death. It is an endless source of joy to all souls of good will. It is the most important fact of the world, the mightiest thing that ever happened. But precisely because it is the greatest event, it is of utmost importance for us to study the impression it made on those that were in touch with it. It would not be a divine work if it were deprived of the human side, I mean the attitude of the men and women who were on the spot, who first heard of it, whom it touched personally.

So we need not be surprised to find that the Evangelists are as much concerned with the behaviour of Christ's disciples on the Resurrection morning as with Christ Himself. In fact, the event itself, the Resurrection, is told with a conciseness of language that is quite remarkable when we compare it with the narration of the things that were said and done by the disciples on that occasion. St. Mark is the only one of the Evangelists who speaks directly of the fact of Christ's rising; and see how simple the words are: "And he rising early the first day of the week, appeared first to Mary Magdalen, out of whom he had cast seven devils" (Mark xvi. 9). St. Matthew begins the wonderful Easter story with the great earthquake and

the apparition of the Angel, being more concerned with the impression made on the guards and the disciples than with the description of the Resurrection itself. The two other Evangelists devote themselves exclusively to the attitude of Christ's followers, taking the divine fact of the Resurrection for granted.

The reason of this extraordinary sobriety of language in describing the supreme event itself, on the one hand, and of the abundance of details with regard to the behaviour of Christ's human *entourage*, is not far to seek. The Resurrection of the Son of God from the dead is not only the most marvellous event, it is also the greatest spiritual fact in the history of the world. Men are divided not only historically but spiritually as they differ in their attitude with regard to this great event. To believe in it, is to be spiritually superior; not to believe in it, is a spiritual catastrophe.

The Holy Ghost has given us in the Gospel a full insight into the working of the minds of those human beings who were round the Tomb that was made glorious on the great morning, whilst so little is revealed to us concerning the way of Christ's actual Resurrection. Nothing could be more profitable to man than to analyse carefully the mental attitude of the disciples on the first Easter day; one can find there, as in an epitome, the mind of the human race concerning the glorious fact of the Resurrection. What Magdalen and Peter and John and the disciples going to Emmaus, and the eleven, and Thomas, and last, but not least, the Roman soldiers said and did on that day, epitomizes most admirably the story of belief and unbelief of which we, in our own days, are the actors and the witnesses, concerning man's attitude towards the mystery of the Resurrection.

It would be impossible to condense into one sermon the lessons contained in the behaviour of the few men and women who played a rôle in the first Easter drama. The Gospel narratives reach a sort of climax in the story of Christ's Resurrection, and we cannot be surprised to find them of palpitating and varied interest when the risen Christ re-enters so suddenly into the lives of the disciples who had already begun to shape their course with the idea that He was no longer part of their existence.

I select for our consideration one feature in the mental attitude of the disciples, a feature that at first sight looks most incomprehensible. Why is it, I ask, that the disciples were such strangers to the thought of their Master's bodily Resurrection, when everything they had ever learned or seen ought to have prepared them for the miracle? Had they not been brought up on the old miracles of the prophets, who raised the dead from their graves not only through the might of their prayers, through the influence of their living presence, but even through the contact of their dead body? Had they not seen with their own eyes the risen daughter of the prince of the synagogue? Had they not been with the Master on the day that He met the sad procession at the gate of Naim, when He had compassion on the widow, and brought back to life her son in the presence of

the whole people? Above all, was not Lazarus with them? Had they not been entertained at a banquet only a few days before at Bethany, a banquet made wonderfully happy by the presence of the risen man. No doubt Lazarus, as a true friend, was among them all during the dark hours of the Master's humiliation and death. How, then, with this unceasing familiarity with the resurrection miracle had it become possible for the disciples to be so entirely estranged from the hope of Christ rising again from the dead? For if one thing is clear in the sacred Gospels it is that mental obtuseness of the disciples with regard to the possibility of a resurrection where Christ Himself was concerned. Are we not confronted here by a flagrant contradiction, a most incomprehensible inconsequence? Yet the contradiction and the inconsequence are merely apparent. The disciples had failed to understand the reasons and the nature of Our Lord's death. They had failed to see the real powers, the real motives behind their Master's humiliation and death, and having failed entirely to grasp the meaning of His death, they could not be expected to be ready for His Resurrection. They could not understand how their beloved Master's death was a voluntary death; they could not see how He had laid down His life of His own free will. Looking at things with human eyes they saw nothing in the Via Dolorosa but the successful machinations of clever and unscrupulous enemies. They felt that the Lord had at last been overpowered, that His wonderful sanctity had met with a foe of equal strength, the dark wickedness of the prince of the people, the omnipotent ruling of Roman power. In their eyes He was a victim, and His destinies were no longer in His own hands.

Yet Our Lord had given a most solemn and a most public warning. Speaking before the whole people He had said: "Therefore doth the Father love me, because I lay down my life that I may take it again. No man taketh it away from me: but I lay it down of myself, and I have power to lay it down and I have power to take it up again. This commandment have I received of my Father" (John x. 17).

Nothing could have been clearer or more explicit than such a declaration. In spite of all appearances Christ was the absolute Master of His own destinies. His death, far from being a sign of weakness, far from being an indication that the Father was no longer with Him, was, on the contrary, the most pleasing, the most spontaneous of all the works which the Son of man had accomplished: "Therefore doth the Father love me, because I lay down my life, that I may take it again."

No doubt if the disciples had understood this, if they had remembered these protestations of their Master, they would have experienced little difficulty in believing His Resurrection. But being still imperfect in faith, they were scandalized at the apparent weakness of Christ; they could not see that "the weakness of God is stronger than men." Their feeling of disappointment was not without its guilt; there was in them a lack of generosity, an absence of fidelity which grieved the heart of

their loving Master. They had been the witnesses of so many miracles, they had seen how He was in the Father and how the Father was in Him; they ought to have been ready to put the most favourable construction on the temporary eclipse of Christ's power; instead of being scandalized, they ought to have followed His progress of abasements with wondering love. After all the miracles that Christ had worked before their eyes, such an attitude was the least thing to which they should have risen. So we are not surprised to hear words of apparent severity from the lips of the risen Lord on the day of His triumph. He had forgiven their base abandonment of Him in the hour of darkness, but for their unbelief He had still a stern rebuke: "O foolish and slow of heart to believe in all things which the prophets have spoken. Ought not Christ to have suffered these things and so to enter into His glory?" (Luke xxiv. 25).

Low Sunday: April 28th.

"Whatsoever is born of God overcometh the world. And this is the victory which overcometh the world: our faith" (I John v. 4).

I am not afraid of being accused of exaggeration if I say that to my mind the unspoken and unconscious cause of the sadness of most people's life is this, that they do not grasp clearly the great fact that there is for each one of us the possibility of a higher life, a better life, a happier life. Our human sadness is the sadness of the captive, of the prisoner in his gaol, because we cannot go out of the narrow precincts of human conditions. Fallen man is a prisoner, captivity is the one word that best describes our sad state. Let it be made clear that human conditions are not stronger than ourselves, that they are not high and solid walls behind which man eats his heart out, and at once the whole aspect of human life is changed. Let it be said to me that it is in me to surmount the most obstinate obstacle, to climb over veritable Alps of difficulties, and the obstacles and the difficulties, far from oppressing my spirits, become the healthy exercise of my best powers.

The grace of Christian redemption is essentially a great breaking of chains, a powerful setting free of those who were in bondage: "To preach deliverance to the captive and sight to the blind, to set at liberty them that are bruised" (Luke iv. 19). Such is Christ's mission. "Ascending on high he led captivity captive" is another most telling phrase of the Scriptures, describing Christ's rôle, representing Him as so entirely subjugating all slavery, all servitude, that He made of captivity His own captive; could there be a better phrase than that to paint that excess of liberty and freedom from the fetterings of human things which is our liberty in the Son of God? On the other hand, St. Paul gives us the gloomiest picture of man untouched by Christ's redeeming grace. He

describes man as being so entangled in the snares of Satan that "they are held captives at his will" (II Tim. ii. 26).

This redemption from captivity is nothing else than the power to lead a higher life, a life which no material, no physical, no social conditions can stifle. Our Christian humility, by a strange anomaly, is a fierce rebellion against the tyranny of temporal exactions, of the oppression of material standards, of the pretensions of the world.

Let us consider, one moment, more attentively what this means, to have it in our power to lead a higher life, to have it in our power, as St. John puts it, to become the children of God. This means at once that a very small section of our being belongs to society, belongs to the State, nay, even belongs to the family. We must be in a way, disturbing elements; Christ is quite explicit about this characteristic of His true disciples: "If you had been of the world, the world would love its own: but because you are not of the world, but I have chosen you out of the world, therefore the world hateth you" (John xv. 19).

To lead a higher life must mean a complete superiority to nature; it must mean unlimited grace; it must mean that there is no possible obstacle to the continuance of that higher life. St. Paul is quite emphatic as to these various conditions for the well-being of the existence of those who "are not of this world." He says: "I am sure that neither death, nor life, nor angels, nor principalities, nor powers, nor things present, nor things to come, nor might, nor height, nor depth, nor any other creature, shall be able to separate us from the love of God which is in Christ Jesus Our Lord" (Rom. viii. 38, 39).

So much of our modern despair is this very thing: the incapacity to believe that it is possible for man to rise above the debasing conditions of the ordinary human existence. Many men have settled down to a dumb and stolid acceptance of evil, both physical and moral. They give the name of folly to the hopes of Christians. Even when they are not downright materialists they expect no more than is implied in the popular dictum that things are bound to come right sooner or later. As for a victory over sin, as for a triumph of grace, as for a divine immortality of soul and body, they have become complete strangers to such realities. Catholic faith shows its innate vitality through its power of saving many millions of souls even to-day from that slough of despondency; for if one thing is palpable and evident it is the sincerity of belief in a higher life in the hearts of Catholics. Not only do they hold that such a life exists but they know that it is within their power to stretch forth their hands and lay hold on eternal life: "For this is the victory that overcomes the world: our faith."

NOTES ON RECENT WORK

I. ASCETICAL AND MYSTICAL THEOLOGY.

BY THE REV. J. CARTMELL, D.D., Ph.D., M.A.

The second volume of *The Complete Works of St. John of the Cross*¹ contains the Spiritual Canticle and the Poems. Like the first volume it is conspicuous, in introductory matter, text and notes, for the care and scholarship of the Spanish editor, P. Silverio, and of the English translator, Professor E. Allison Peers. The Spiritual Canticle has survived in two versions, both traditionally ascribed to St. John. The second purports to be a careful revision of the first. It contains one stanza more, and reshuffles all the middle stanzas in order to present the ascent of the soul in a more logical sequence; its commentary is a quarter as long again as the first. In the earliest printed editions of the Canticle, i.e., in the French edition of 1622 and the Brussels Spanish edition of 1627, only the first version was published. The Madrid edition of 1630 compromised somewhat; it gave the first version, but inserted the extra stanza (XI) from the second. The important Seville edition of 1703, which remained standard until 1912, put the second version to the fore. The critical edition of Toledo (1912-1914) followed suit; it printed the second version in the body of the text and the first as an appendix.

Recently a strong attack has been delivered on the authenticity of the second version by a competent critic, Dom Chevallier, O.S.B., in various review articles and in his critical French edition (Desclée, 1930). His conclusions have won widespread, but not universal, acceptance. Fr. Silverio, among others, does not feel their cogency. Hence he gives both versions in their entirety in the edition before us. It is not possible to do justice to the discussion in a mere summary, since it depends for its full appreciation on a close scrutiny of the contents and arrangement of the stanzas of the Canticle. But the key-point is the degree of the love of God possible here below. According to Dom Chevallier, the first version teaches, as a God-inspired doctrine, that the soul in its highest earthly state in the mystical marriage loves God with a love of equality, but the second changes this entirely and reserves such love for the Beatific Vision. According to his opponents, the contrast is not so complete as he maintains, since in the first version the love is said to be equal *after some manner*, which qualifying phrase makes all the difference; there, too, full equality is reserved for Heaven.

¹ Burns Oates & Washbourne, Ltd. 15s. The first volume was noticed in the CLERGY REVIEW of June, 1934, p. 513.

The Poems are twenty-two in number. Only five or six attain the highest level of poetry. The three greatest are those which form the basis of St. John's prose commentaries; they rank very high indeed in the poetical literature of Spain. "The first and finest of the poems," writes Fr. Silverio, "is the 'Spiritual Canticle,' of which we now have forty stanzas, though originally there may have been no more than seventeen. Largely inspired by the Song of Songs, it unfolds the story of the quest of Divine love in the form of an allegory enriched with a great wealth of images, showing among other things how intimate was its author's appreciation of Hebrew poetry. Nevertheless he is in the best sense original throughout. He strips all earthly creatures, as it were, of their adornments in order to weave from them a more regal mantle to Divine love than any imagined by the muses of Greece or Rome. He interprets aspirations and emotions of the human soul which are all but ineffable, and pours them forth in language never surpassed outside Holy Scripture."

The English translator reproduces the poems very accurately, even to their metre; but he admits that "in general the originals of all the poems are somewhat simpler in language than these translations on account of the freedom which any translator of verse into verse must needs permit himself."

My love is as the hills,
The lonely valleys clad with forest trees,
The rushing, sounding rills,
Strange isles in distant seas,
Lover-like whisperings, murmurs of the breeze.

My love is hush-of-night,
Is dawn's first breathings in the heav'n above,
Still music veil'd from sight,
Calm that can echoes move,
The feast that brings new strength—the feast of love.

These two stanzas (XIV and XV) from the "Spiritual Canticle," addressed by the Soul-Bride to God, her Beloved, whom she is seeking, illustrate excellently the qualities of St. John noted above; and in their English form they are good poetry. But, of course, St. John is not always so tractable to English handling.

The second volume of *Ecrits Spirituels* of the late Père de Grandmaison, S.J., consists of notes of his Retreat discourses.² He naturally bases himself on the Spiritual Exercises of St. Ignatius; but there is a freshness and originality about him that make his work anything but a dry commentary on the Exercises. The volume does not give a complete description of the spiritual life or discuss details of prayer and the practice

² Paris, Beauchesne. 20 fr. The first volume (Conferences) was very briefly noticed in the CLERGY REVIEW of January, 1934, p. 61.

of virtue. That has already been done in the first volume. Rather it puts the retreatant in direct contact with Christ in a very real way, and makes him consider his life, its failures and its purposes, as He sees it. Wisdom, breadth of view, insight and a sense of reality are the outstanding qualities of de Grandmaison. I will translate a short section; it displays his qualities, and it has a particular meaning for priests and others who are called to the apostolate: "Brief Reflections on Real Perfection, IV (End of the Second Week of the Exercises).

We must die to spiritual sweetness, sought too eagerly. Even in our life of piety there is matter, and very much matter, for mortification.

1. We must die to the desire of seeing and controlling everything in our spiritual life, of advancing only on known and explored country; of giving an account of everything in detail; of seeing ourselves progress. On the contrary, we must often, for good reasons, advance into the unknown, with the impression of taking a risk and losing our foothold; ceasing to rely on ourselves, on what we see and know, in order to trust God unconditionally.

2. We must die to the desire of spiritual sweetness in long, carefully guarded and solitary prayers, which a jealous recollection protects, in order to work, to loan ourselves to the world, to do the work of an apostle amidst the dust and the noise. . . . Often also (we must be content) not to have the time, the leisure, the strength to pray as we would wish. To accept a life divided, and disputed by work, engagements, etc.

3. We must die to the desire of graces of prayer, sweet and varied, in order to commit ourselves to the Providence of God, who very often will lead us through aridities, divers temptations, the heights and the depths, scruples, obscurities, anxieties. We must go through all that to reach the goal. But let us take courage. Jacob served seven years for Rachel, and they appeared to him as a day. (Rachel is a traditional symbol of the contemplative life.)

A book by a priest on the mission is something of an event; "the why is as plain as way to parish church." *Living Faith* is a book on Ascetics, written by a parish priest.³ It sets out the principles and methods of the spiritual life for the benefit of the average Christian. It treats of Creation and its purpose, sin, the Fall, our spiritual enemies; the Christian ideal and its attainment by a vivid faith, humility, the poverty of Christ, mortification and the cross, the love of one's neighbour; marriage and the Christian home, prayer, the sacraments of Penance and the Holy Eucharist, the Mother of men. The author ends each chapter with a few Considerations; they are pointed and practical. The whole book is distinguished for lofty thought and strong piety and for a sureness and delicacy

³ Canon Thomas Wright. The Bishop of Middlesbrough honours it with a preface. Burns Oates & Washbourne. pp. viii., 196. 6s

of touch that is born of long experience of men. It is a rich book, full of the splendour and charm of the Catholic life. The style is clear, with many a happy illustration to drive home the transcendent truths about creation, grace, etc. It is a book that deserves to be widely known and deeply pondered.⁴

*Marvels of Grace*⁵ is a translation from the French of a series of lectures, which develop in a logical sequence the theology of the life of grace or the Divine indwelling, its nature, effects and consummation. It is a very useful book because of its clarity and dogmatic spirituality, and because it treats of the positive side of the life of holiness.

*Dominican Spirituality*⁶ is the first of a series of books to be known as the Dominican Library of Spiritual Works. It consists of five articles, written by some of the most distinguished French and Belgian Dominicans. The titles of the articles will show the scope and the value of the book. They are: Saint Dominic, His Physical and Moral Physiognomy; The Historical Development of Dominican Spirituality; The Character and Principles of Dominican Spirituality; The Place of the Liturgy in Dominican Spirituality; Dominican Prayer.

The Abiding Presence of the Holy Ghost, by the late Fr. Bede Jarrett, O.P.,⁷ was written in New York in 1918. After being out of print for some time, it has now been republished in England. It is an adaptation and re-arrangement in the form of meditations of a French work, *De l'habitation du S. Esprit dans les âmes justes*, by Père Froget, O.P. It deals with God's Presence in general and His special Presence in the souls of the just; the mode and effects of this Presence; the Gifts of the Holy Ghost and their individual characteristics; the Fruits; the Beatitudes. It was well worth republishing, if only for the supreme value of the doctrine for all who would savour the full meaning of the spiritual life.

A few more biographies, popular in size and treatment have been published. *The Life of St. Dominic*⁸ is a second edition of the detailed and scholarly life by Fr. Bede Jarrett, which first appeared in 1924. *Mère Ignace Gæthals*⁹ describes the interior life and the external activity of the saintly third Mother-General of the Congregation of Notre-Dame de Namur. Her short period of office fell in troubled times, when the very life of the new institute was threatened by the Dutch attack on all

⁴ But I have a qualm about one statement: "He endured His crucifixion from His conception in His mother's womb to Calvary, and the reality of the Cross added not an iota to His lifelong suffering."

⁵ By the Rev. Victor Many, S.S. Trans. by the Rev. Albert D. Talbot, S.S. Milwaukee, The Bruce Publishing Co., and Coldwell, London. 4s. 6d.

⁶ Trans. by Rev. Anselm Townsend, O.P. Bruce (Coldwell). 5s. 6d.

⁷ Burns Oates & Washbourne, Ltd. 2s. 6d.

⁸ Burns Oates & Washbourne, Ltd. 3s. 6d.

⁹ Ouseley. pp. 220. 3s. 6d.

things Catholic in Belgium. But through her, under God, the Congregation triumphed, although she did not live to see its final approbation by the Holy See, and began its far-spreading development in America. *St. Bernadette of Lourdes*¹⁰ is a translation of the brightly written life by her fellow-countryman, François Duhourcau.

*The Insight of the Curé d'Ars*¹¹ is a large collection of anecdotes illustrating the Saint's power over souls and his gifts of reading hearts and prophesying. The stories are fully authentic; the writer has made sure of his facts, and he is the most competent authority in France on the Curé d'Ars and author of the best modern life.

Books of notes for sermons hardly fall within the scope of these Notes. But here are two that will be found helpful to set the preacher's mind going and give him a line when he is preparing his own discourses. They are *Sermon Matter for a Year*, by the Rev. Aloysius Roche,¹² and *Living for God*, by the Rev. John S. Middleton, Ph.D.¹³

II. CATHOLIC LITERATURE.

BY THE REV. S. J. GOSLING.

Sanctity, by Violet Clifton,¹ has the right, on several counts, to be at the head of these notes; its poetic form, its subject matter, the boldness of its conception, all these entitle it to the place of honour; and some acknowledgment, too, is due to the publishers for their insight and courage in sponsoring the book. The publishing of poetry is a chancey business and when the poetry bears the added description of being religious the probability of its being a financial success is proportionately reduced. But fortunately there is a public, larger than any merely literary circle, which desires to see its religious aspirations clothed in language of befitting nobility. Its taste has been whetted by such writers as Henri Gheon and Paul Claudel. Violet Clifton has not, indeed, the profundity of these writers, but neither has she their occasional tortuousness; she writes according to the English tradition of literature which has always endeavoured to convey thought and not merely to express it. She has, therefore, an interest in the mind of the reader which is not always apparent in the case of many Latin poets and in some of our modern poets. They are so completely absorbed in their efforts of self-expression as to be indifferent to the desire

¹⁰ Sands. pp. 282. 5s. It has six illustrations.

¹¹ By Chanoine F. Trochu. Trans. by Maurice Leahy. His Grace the Archbishop of Tuam honours it with a Preface. pp. xxxvi., 216. Burns Oates & Washbourne, Ltd. 10s. 6d.

¹² Sands. 5s.

¹³ New York, P. J. Kennedy & Sons. \$2.

¹ Sheed & Ward. 5s.

of other minds to comprehend their meaning. There are critics who maintain that this aloofness is the hall-mark of the true artist, and that any adjustment made to ensure the profit of a mutual understanding reveals the commercial salesman. There is some little truth in this opinion; it is right that the artist should be indifferent to public sentiment as it affects the quality of his work, but not as it affects its utility; a cup should be capable of holding liquor, a house is built to be lived in, literature is written to please or persuade. If this test may not be applied criticism is dead, for it can have no standards outside the mind of the creative artist.

Sanctity is a dramatized version of the life of St. Elizabeth of Hungary, and the author must have realized the self-imposed handicap of her title, for, to confess the truth, sanctity is not a pleasant word for most of us. We are prepared to grant it as an attribute of the saints, but a too close acquaintance with it is a reproach to our worldliness. Instinctively we are on the defensive to excuse our self-indulgence. Mrs. Clifton has accepted the challenge and brilliantly sustained her theme. The character of Elizabeth unfolds itself before our eyes, with never a false note, neither of harshness nor of sentimentality, until she becomes Sanctity personified. About the technical aspects of the author's verse form and dramatic construction there will be discussion, but hardly, I imagine, disagreement, so subtly is the form wedded to the sense. The employment of a chorus after the manner of the Greeks must await production before its effectiveness can be judged. For the reader, though some of the finest poetry is given to the chorus, the general effect is to hold up the action of the play in order to emphasize the obvious. But an audience is slower-witted than a single reader, and on the stage the chorus may find its proper place. *Sanctity* is a very remarkable work, something quite new in our literary experience.

Though I have long been an admirer of Margaret Yeo's novels, nothing that I had previously read of her work had quite prepared me for the sustained beauty and (though the word must not be misunderstood) the grandeur of *Don John of Austria*.² Grandeur may suggest purple passages; there are none in this book if I understand the phrase aright. A purple passage is a vulgarism, the clothing of a mean thought or a commonplace fact in language above its station. Mrs. Yeo has, of course, a noble theme, nothing less than the life story of one of the most romantic figures in history. Rich colours befit Don John of Austria, even as he affected in his dress, crimson cloak, pearl-sewn doublet, and golden armour. This fondness for colour, which he maintained in defiance of the sombre fashions of the Spanish court, is symbolic of other differences that set him apart from his fellows, his decisiveness in action in contrast with the wavering caution of his half-brother, Philip II,

² Sheed & Ward. 7s. 6d.

his singleness of purpose in the midst of tortuous intrigues, his contempt for money when all his subordinates were using every means to enrich themselves. His biographer has seized upon these differences to make her hero stand out, a figure of light against a dark and repelling background. How far she has used her imagination to heighten the relief I am not competent to say; I can only testify that her undocumented and imagined narrative is always in keeping with those facts for which she gives chapter and verse in quoting from contemporary letters. One small criticism I would interpose: Mrs. Yeo has a fondness for hackneyed quotations which she makes more glaring by placing them between inverted commas: "soft eyes looked love to eyes that spake again" is too reminiscent of Waterloo, Beau Brummel and the Rothschilds to be in the picture with the last knight of Christendom. The curtain goes down on tragedy that would be too poignant but that Don John of Austria with all his faults had kept before his young imagination the vision of a reward beyond all earthly honours.

We meet Philip II again in *The Emerald Pawn*, by O. MacNamara,³ and we cannot help wondering what would have been the course of history if the accident of birth had placed Don John of Austria on his brother's throne. Three women, not to speak of poor Mary Tudor, would have had a different ally, enemy and dupe, Mary, Queen of Scots, Elizabeth of England, and Catherine de Medici—fruitless but interesting speculations! *The Emerald Pawn* is an attempt to tell the story of Ireland's early martyrs in the form of a novel, but history and imagination are not blended with the artistry shown by Mrs. Yeo; the powder tastes the jam and the confection is streaky.

You will do well before opening Mr. Christopher Hollis' *Sir Thomas More*,⁴ to make up your mind as to what kind of book you wish to read, the life of a saint, or the defence of a great Catholic protagonist, or an objective account of a momentous epoch in religious history. I expected the last and was disappointed, and I find it difficult to prevent my disappointment colouring my view of Mr. Hollis' work. In writing it he seems to have had one eye on Rome where the cause of Blessed Thomas More's canonization was being debated. To influence opinion there was, of course, a perfectly legitimate and desirable motive, but it was not likely to produce the book I wanted to read and wanted to give to my non-Catholic fellow-countrymen. More was a typical Englishman—or so we like to think. At any rate he was typical in the sense that his actions and his motives, his blend of commonsense and humour, of simple faith and outspoken criticism, do not need to be explained to his own people. English Protestants will not agree with More's spiritual allegiance but they will understand the man if he is allowed to

³ M. H. Gill & Son. 7s. 6d.

⁴ Sheed & Ward. 7s. 6d.

speak for himself. An unnecessary defence may give rise to more suspicions than an open accusation. I take as an example Mr. Hollis' long chapter on More's *Utopia*. The Utopians profess curiously un-Christian notions of religion and morals. Mr. Hollis replies with justice that they are supposed to be living under conditions of merely natural religion. Is there any need further to labour the point? In Mr. Hollis' words, it is "not difficult . . . to find telling sarcasm with which to expose the contrast between the professions and practice of Christianity." Utopia-makers and moralists generally have adopted More's recipe. Swift did it with the Houyhnhnms, but he would not have had us become horses any more than the moralists would have us become ants, or bees, or little birds that in their nest agree. I realize that I am criticizing Mr. Hollis for not having written the book that I expected of him. What he has done, however, and in the way he has chosen to do it, he has done remarkably well; but I look forward to the time when our historians will deem that they have sufficiently redressed the adverse balance of the Whig writers and will settle down to give us history without all those wearisome controversies and let the plain facts appeal to the plain man.

One naturally looks for an archbishop to be a man of outstanding ability for no one attains to such eminence without conspicuous qualities of mind and character. Judged even by these high standards Dr. Downey is pre-eminent. He possesses a mind of quite remarkable keenness allied to a gift of exposition, clear, racy, and humorous, so that his *Critical and Constructive Essays*⁵ might be called philosophy without tears, and, indeed, with frequent bursts of laughter. Old-fashioned pedants will think him flippant, but the Archbishop is not that; a careful reading of these essays has failed to discover a single instance in which Dr. Downey has used a laugh to cover up a weak argument, to evade an attack, or to ridicule an opponent unjustly. The truth is, the Archbishop sees, more quickly than most people, the humorous illustration, the neat riposte, and the chance of deflating pompous verbiage by a witty phrase, and he simply cannot resist the temptation to share the fun with his audience. As a consequence he has given us a book which treats of some of the deepest mysteries of life, and yet, so easily does His Grace carry his learning, the reader is led step by step across the most difficult places. Only once does the Archbishop himself seem to falter, when he is expounding the Anselmian argument for the existence of God, but that may be because he is too good a Thomist to be completely sympathetic with St. Anselm. However, I am not competent to challenge Dr. Downey on a question of metaphysics; I prefer to record my thanks for much instruction and not a little amusement, and particularly for the timely warning, contained in the essay on Psycho-analysis, not to allow the exaggerations and absurdities of a few psycho-

⁵ Burns Oates & Washbourne. 5s.

analysts to destroy our interest in a genuine discovery. Dr. Downey says:—

“Only too often in the past have we stood aside and allowed a new discovery to be moulded in the interests of materialistic or agnostic philosophy. It was late in the day before rationalists were made to feel that the study of comparative religion was a two-edged weapon. Need we leave it so late before taking the psycho-analytic method out of the hands of the secularists?”

I have received a copy of *Restoration*,⁶ being an account of Mr. Ross Hoffman's spiritual progress “from a meaningless world to the Catholic Church.” Mr. Hoffman, who is a professor of history in the University of New York, has felt the urge to describe his experiences for the benefit of other searchers after truth; he has also felt compelled to apologize for his *apologia*: there is no need. It is true that Catholics are sometimes irritated by having their religion explained to them by neo-converts, but the irritation, when it exists, is usually caused by the suggestion that we have not realized the height and the depth of the faith we profess. This poor opinion of our awareness is a carry-over from the convert's sceptical days, for it is a rare experience to find an unbeliever who can credit us with having faced all his objections and known all his difficulties and still be staunch in our belief. Herein lies the great advantage of such a book as *Restoration*. It is the personal record of a journey along an unfrequented road; the interest is in the adventures of the pilgrim on his way rather than in what he finds on his arrival, for that can be better and more fully explained by a native of the country. Mr. Hoffman's book proves the truth of this criticism. His first chapter, excellent as it is, nearly kills the book; it is an indictment of modern scepticism, and it has been done before and, it is no reflection on Mr. Hoffman to say, it has been done better. However, he begins his second chapter with the words: “I will tell my own story,” and at once the interest quickens and the book lives, for it is the story of a singularly frank, modest and engaging personality. Mr. Hoffman's interests are historical and sociological so that his path to Rome was beset by whole gangs of bogeys. The modern world regards the Catholic Church as an anachronism and considers her present policy (Mr. Hoffman did) as reactionary. But, as he came to see, the real revolutionaries are not Rousseau, Marx and Bertrand Russell, but Leo XIII and Pius XI. It is surely an extraordinary thing that the philosophy of the world which seems to satisfy the man of the world does so little for him. It has nothing to say on the question of what we are or why we are; it exhorts us to reason and implores us to adopt a purpose in life, and it denies both reason and purpose at either end of the brief span of our existence.

To my mind Miss Sheila Kaye-Smith has not fulfilled the

⁶ Sheed & Ward. 6s.

promise of her earlier work. *Superstition Corner* and *Gallybird* have not the humanity or the breadth of treatment that were apparent in, for example, *The Last of the House of Alard* or *Joanna Godden*. Both the former read as though Miss Kaye-Smith had lost the desire to tell a story. In *Gallybird*,⁷ except for the two Ladies Alard who both live and breathe, the one a gipsy-girl and the other a French Catholic aristocrat, the characters are puppets jerked hither and thither to make a none too credible story. There is much talk of magic, but the author is a child of her age afraid of the superior smiles of the scientist, so while she tries to make our flesh creep she leaves us free, if we are so minded, to find an explanation in nothing more real than a bad dream. As a consequence the tale loses both power and reality. But we are glad to have made the acquaintance of the Dowager Lady Alard.

Stand and Give Challenge, by Francis MacManus,⁸ has a theme which the Irish genius seems to find so irresistibly attractive; it is a story full of violence, bloodshed and unrelieved misery. It paints the familiar picture, the condition of the Irish peasantry—the actual period is immaterial for the shadows are always at their blackest and evil at its most triumphant. It is not acceptable that an Englishman should protest against Ireland's fondness for licking her wounds, for it may quite truthfully be retorted that his countrymen have caused them; but a critic may question its artistic value, and I see it has been done, tactfully, by an admirer on the dust-cover of this book. Mr. Maurice Walsh praises the book and prophesies that when Mr. MacManus "comes to develop his shades and high lights he will teach us all." My misgivings have deeper roots. It is not good for man or nation, as our own poet has warned us, "to make a wanton of our woe." Self-pity is a kind of wantonness sapping the strength and ensnaring energy and will in a teasing dalliance. Soon, "Sorrow, be thou my God," says the soul, and even life's simplest joys become disloyalties. If the dead past may not bury its dead, if story and song must ever keep open the old wounds, if Ireland must forever regard herself as a dispossessed and persecuted nation—why, then, she must! These quarrels between men and men matter not so much. But it is not good that a nation should be brought up in the idea that God rewards only with stripes. That way lies rebellion, and the sudden uprising of a cold, fierce, satanic hatred of God, His Church and His priests. The story-tellers of Ireland should take thought.

It is a remarkable feat of journalism that *G.K.'s Weekly*, with no financial backing, has attained and passed its five hundredth issue. It is even more remarkable that a compiler has been able to collect over 130 contributions which can bear the light of day again after being buried in back numbers. The

⁷ Cassell. 7s. 6d.

⁸ Talbot Press. 7s. 6d.

outcome is a goodly volume, entitled *G.K.'s*,⁹ of 320 pages, illustrating the work of some sixty essayists, poets and cartoonists. These numerical details must take the place of a review for it is obviously impossible to treat adequately of so many different writers. They have, however, one thing in common, to preach the truth that the possession of private property is the only sure safeguard of personal liberty threatened by Socialism on the one side and by Trusts and Big Business on the other.

I do not expect to be believed when I commend as a literary masterpiece a book of religious instruction for children. But I confidently expect an apology if any one who doubts me will take the trouble to read *Children of the Lantern*, by "Lamp-lighter," illustrated by "Robin."¹⁰

It seems a long, long time ago since Fennimore Cooper guided us, shivering with excitement and expecting to be scalped at any moment, through the haunts of Red Indians in the waste lands of North America. Then Canada got built up and we departed to South Africa and had delicious thrills among Zulus and Kaffirs. But eventually these names came to stand for mining shares, and so lost their romance. Now Sir George Dunbar is leading expeditions in the Malay States and even penetrating into Tibet. In *Jungbir: Secret Agent*¹¹ we meet our old enemies, the evil, bloodthirsty and ruthless savages, and our old friends, the noble, loyal but equally ruthless native allies. We may be getting too old for these hair-raising adventures, but the younger generation will enjoy them.

Miss Agnes Blundell has many admirers of her historical novels, and I feel I ought to apologize for not being of their number. To portray for young readers the lives of children in the past, to tell their adventures in quick-moving narrative, and to describe conditions so different from our circumstances, all this is no light task. But yet with all her industry and knowledge Miss Blundell seems to trip too frequently. I cannot believe, for example, that children of the time of Charles I used the word "salaam," and do ten-year-old children of that or any other age use phrases like *sub rosa*? They do in Miss Blundell's novel *In Peril for the King*,¹² and it puts me off. It may be silly and pedantic of me, but there it is.

⁹ Rich & Cowan. 7s. 6d.

¹⁰ Burns Oates & Washbourne. 3s. 6d.

¹¹ Burns Oates & Washbourne. 3s. 6d.

¹² Burns Oates & Washbourne. 3s. 6d.

QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS

THE POWERS AND TITLE OF DEANS.

The *Catholic Directory* under "Ecclesiastical Titles" states: "*Deans* used thus as a prefix is incorrect. There are no *Deans*, properly so called, in the Catholic Church in England." Is this correct?

In pre-Reformation times was there not a Dean at the head of the Chapter, and Rural Deans with lesser rank and power? What exactly was their office and position? Does it still exist in any country? I have heard it stated in some Catholic countries the Deans have special power and rank and a distinctive dress. (V. F.)

REPLY.

In pre-Reformation days the title of "Dean" was given to the head of the Chapter. He was the greatest of the four dignitaries belonging to the old cathedrals.

Our correspondent, however, is mainly interested in the office of "rural dean," a very different institution, with an interesting history. Between the sixth and ninth centuries, the practice arose in the Church of dividing the greater dioceses into "archdeaconries," under the vigilance and supervision of an "archdeacon." To facilitate administration, there was a further division of archdeaconries into sections, known variously by the names "*decania*," "*archipresbyteratus*," or "*christianitas*." These territorial divisions were presided over by "Archpriests" or "Rural Deans," whose power, as Wernz-Vidal points out, was "*satis restricta*."¹ This restriction is relative to the power and authority of the Archdeacons, whose claims to authority and independence were so great that the Bishops were ultimately obliged to deprive them of their prerogatives. Their powers were transferred in large measure to the Rural Deans. Ayrinhac gives a good summary of the duties of the Rural Dean: "The Dean made every year the visitation of his district and reported to the Bishop on the canonical status of the clergy, the manner in which they fulfilled their duties and administered the Sacraments: on their mode of life particularly in regard to the law of celibacy: on the condition of ecclesiastical property, the sacred vessels and vestments, the church and school. He administered solemn penance, presented the candidates to the Bishop for ordination, exercised judicial power and could inflict penalties, even excommunication, according to some authorities. He held every month a general meeting of his clergy for the discussion of matters pertaining to their office, and presided also at other gatherings, at funerals and similar occasions."² This represents the common law of the Church which was followed in England in pre-Reformation times. Thus the *Oxford Dictionary* describes Rural Dean as "a presbyter invested with jurisdiction or precedence over a division of an archdeaconry."

¹ II, *De Personis* (No. 715).

² *Constitution of the Church in the New Code*, p. 286.

It also mentions that before the Reformation he had large powers of administration and jurisdiction.

In modern times, up to the publication of the Code, the institution or suppression of the office of Rural Dean was left to the discretion of the Bishop. An expression of the Church's policy is found in the first Provincial Council of Westminster: "Praeter vicarium generalem, poterit episcopus etiam alios vicarios foraneos, seu prout in Anglia nuncupari solebant, et nunc vulgari sermone dicuntur rural deans (*decanos rurales*) nominare, cum delegatione scripta quarumdem, quas expedire iudicaverit, facultatum, in certo quodam districtu exercendarum."³ In the succeeding paragraph of the decree, it is laid down that it pertains to the rural dean to preside at conferences, to be solicitous for the sick clergy, to be watchful of the administration of church goods, and the care of ecclesiastical buildings, and to report to the Ordinary matters which may need correction.

When the Code of Canon Law came into force, the territorial division of dioceses into deaneries ceased to be a matter of choice. Should any Bishop find that the division, because of local circumstances, is impossible or inopportune, he must refer the matter to the Holy See.⁴ It is interesting to note that the legislator, through respect for local and traditional usage, does not insist on uniformity of terminology for describing the divisions of the diocese. Three terms are mentioned expressly, but the use of "etc." allows for any other appropriate term. It is, therefore, quite consistent, when referring to the "vicarius foraneus" in the vernacular, to use the term which is locally accepted—a fact which is stated or implied by most commentators on the Code. In several, if not all, English dioceses, there exists a division into deaneries, in conformity with the Westminster Synod, and the subsequent legislation of the Code.⁵ By diocesan legislation, in some places, special faculties are given to the priest in charge of the deanery,⁶ such as the faculty of granting visiting priests jurisdiction for hearing confessions.

The deanery thus established is clearly the "decanatus" of which there is question in canon 217, §1. A glance through the published Synods of various dioceses shows us that it is the accepted custom amongst Bishops to refer to the "vicarius foraneus" as "*the Dean*." On the grounds of his office and the current usage of the term, we can see no reason for questioning the accuracy of the word as a descriptive title. In some dioceses it is quite commonly used as a prefix. In favour of this, it may be urged that it is desirable to have some title by which to designate an official, whose position in the present discipline is of considerable importance. Moreover, adhering

³ Decr., XIV, 2.

⁴ Canon 217, §2.

⁵ Canons 445-450.

⁶ Canon 447, §1.

to Catholic ecclesiastical terminology there is no danger of ambiguity in the usage, since the word has no other application amongst us. No doubt, the writer in the *Catholic Directory* is concerned about the Protestant usage now in possession, so to speak, in England. There is, of course, much weight in this objection: but the present writer is of opinion that it can hardly be urged in this connection, where the established use of the title in several dioceses rests on episcopal authority, and is quite in conformity with the freedom allowed by the Code.

From what has been said it is evident that the office and the name of "Rural Dean" very definitely exist, not merely in some Catholic countries, but in England. The "special powers" to which our enquirer alludes are expressly contemplated in canon 447, §1. The "rank" or precedence of the Dean is provided for in canon 450, §2, where he is given precedence over all the priests of his district. The mere fact of being deputed to preside at the conference does not entitle a priest to be called "Dean." Where, for convenience, there are several conference centres in one Deanery, the Dean remains responsible for the correct observance of the prescriptions on the holding of conferences.⁷

It is quite true that in some continental countries, the Vicars Forane have distinctive dress. The Decree of the Synod of Chiavari, Italy, grants to the Vicars Forane the "*ius rochetum et cappinum*" deferendi, hoc violaceum si archipresbyteri, rubrum vero si praepositi sint."⁸

PATRICK J. HANRAHAN.

CONFESSIONS OF RELIGIOUS.

1. Does Canon 521, §2, apply exclusively to cloistered nuns? May it be said that the same canon does not apply in England?
2. May Canon 522 be so interpreted that a superior, while allowing a sister to avail herself of this canon, has the right to dismiss her after the expiration of her temporary vows?
3. If a priest without diocesan faculties is given faculties by a religious superior to hear the confessions of the inmates dwelling *die noctuque* in the religious house, may the said priest hear the confessions also of others who present themselves? The confessions are heard in the parish church. (COWLEY.)

REPLY.

ad. 1. Canon 521, §2: "Ordinarii locorum, in quibus religiosarum communitates existunt, aliquot sacerdotes pro singulis domibus designent, ad quos pro sacramento poenitentiae in casibus particularibus recurrere eae facile possint, quin necessarium sit ipsum Ordinarium toties quoties adire." The rule is part of the legislation of recent years, which has for its purpose to secure a wider freedom for religious women in

⁷ Canon 448, §1.

⁸ *Syn. Dioec. Clavarensis*, 1922, Art. IV, No. 84g.

choosing a confessor, while maintaining the discipline which requires an "ordinary" confessor to function normally for all the nuns in any given house (Canon 520). A religious, therefore, has this "ordinary" confessor; she has also the right to request an "ordinary" confessor all to herself (Canon 520, §2); she has, of course, the "extraordinary" confessor of Canon 521, §1, who visits the house four times a year; she has, in addition, the right to confess "*ad conscientiae tranquillitatem*" to any confessor in a church or semi-public oratory, provided he is approved for women's confessions (Canon 522). Finally, there are the confessors nominated for each house, who may be called in for particular cases.

Our correspondent's question, it appears, arises from a very natural deduction that there is no point in the special confessor of Canon 521, §2, except in the case of religious who cannot avail themselves of Canon 522, i.e., those who are cloistered. But the law draws no distinction between cloistered and non-cloistered nuns, though it may well be that the confessor of Canon 521, §2, will not usually be summoned except by cloistered religious. Moreover, Canon 521, §2 and Canon 522 do not really overlap. Many religious institutes are rightly averse to their subjects leaving the convent, even though they are not cloistered. Therefore, the answer to the first part of the question is that the rule applies to all communities of religious women. To the second part of the question the answer is that the rule applies to England as to every other part of the Church.

ad 2. Canon 522: "*Si, non obstante praescripto canon 520, 521, aliqua religiosa, ad suae conscientiae tranquillitatem, confessorium adeat ab Ordinario loci pro mulieribus approbatum, confessio in qualibet ecclesia vel oratorio etiam semi-publico peracta, valida et licita est, revocato quolibet contrario privilegio; neque Antistita id prohibere potest aut de ea re inquirere, ne indirecte quidem; et religiosa nihil Antistitae referre tenetur.*" The terms of this law have given rise to more discussions and replies of the Codex Commission than, perhaps, any other canon of the Code. Happily, the question raised here is very simple and scarcely needs an answer. The superior in question may not dismiss a religious, precisely because she uses her canonical right with regard to confession. On the contrary, the superior herself is liable to be dismissed from her office, according to the terms of Canon 2414, the last canon of the Code.

ad 3. The powers of a religious superior to grant faculties for hearing the confession of his subjects (Canon 875) are often widely interpreted. But if, as it appears in this query, the penitents are in no sense subjects of the religious superior, the confessor requires for the validity of his absolution a jurisdiction other than that conferred upon him by the religious superior. Cf. Cann. 874, 875.

E. J. M.

EXTRAORDINARY CONFESSOR.

An extraordinary confessor, visiting the convent to which he is appointed four times a year, finds that certain members of the community do not make their confession to him. Is it not the law that they are bound to do so and, if so, what steps should he take in the matter? (W. H. C.)

REPLY.

Canon 521, §1: "Unicuique religiosarum communitati detur confessarius extraordinarius qui quater saltem in anno ad domum religiosam accedat et cui omnes religiosae se sistere debent, saltem benedictionem recepturae." By this law, *all* the religious, including their superior, are bound to present themselves before the extraordinary confessor, but they are not bound to confess their sins to him, unless they wish to do so. The regulation, which goes back to the Council of Trent, has for its purpose, to safeguard peace of conscience amongst the religious. Benedict XIV, in explaining the law, points out that if some visited this confessor, and others did not, it might result in certain suspicions and undesirable comparisons.¹ It is quite certain that all are bound to obey the law. But, whether the matter is of such moment that the confessor should take steps to secure its observance must be left to his discretion. *L'Ami du Clergé* advises the confessor to bring the matter to the notice of the Ordinary,² and there may be circumstances in which this course is to be followed. But, in our opinion, the confessor is not bound to take on himself this rather onerous task, unless he knows that some harm is resulting to the community from the non-observance of the law. Probably it would suffice to discuss the matter with the local superior: more likely than not the religious, who do not present themselves, know that they are not bound to *confess* to the "extraordinary" and wrongly conclude that they need not appear at all.

E. J. M.

¹ Cf. Sobradillo *De Religiosarum Confessariis*, p. 148.

² 1927, p. 635.

ROMAN DOCUMENTS

BY THE REV. A. BENTLEY, Ph.D., M.A.

THE IMPENDING CANONIZATION.

The bulk of the evidence in the cause of canonization of Blessed John Fisher and Blessed Thomas More must naturally be sought in the great mass of contemporary or quasi-contemporary literature, to which they themselves made notable contributions. In the expert handling and sifting of this evidence, the newly-instituted *Historical Section* of the S.C. of Rites has performed a gigantic task, and has been publicly thanked by the Holy Father. By the Pope's express wish the work has gone forward with unusual rapidity, a special procedure being admitted, and all necessary dispensations *a signis seu miraculis*, such as the Code itself allows for in the *beatification* of a martyr, have been readily granted in this final stage.

Following on a great crusade of prayer, and numerous petitions from representative bodies in this country, the Pope ordered a General Meeting of the S.C. of Rites, to be held in his own presence on January 29th, in which took place the final summing-up of all the evidence concerning the fact and cause of martyrdom, and the signs or miracles adduced in the cause. After this, the Pope as usual devoted several days to careful consideration of this evidence and earnest prayer, and finally decided on the reading of the relevant decree on February 10th.

That date was a memorable one for English Catholics. In the presence of a select audience, the Secretary of Rites read a decree outlining the story of the two martyrs and the progress of the cause, right up to the Papal decision that "the martyrdom and the cause of martyrdom of Blessed John Cardinal Fisher and Blessed Thomas More are so evidently established that, every other opportune and necessary dispensation from signs or Miracles being granted, it is possible to proceed to further acts."

The Bishop of Southwark thanked the Holy Father in the name of England's Catholic hierarchy and laity, and the Pope replied in warm and noble terms. He spoke of the qualities which endeared each of these martyrs to their own generation and to posterity, and entered intimately into special aspects of their lives and deaths. He recalled the interest shown in our martyrs by the beatification of fifty-four under Leo XIII and one hundred and forty during the present pontificate. Of this mighty throng, Fisher and More were the leaders and champions. Unhappily, death has robbed the late Cardinal Bourne of the joy of sharing in the martyrs' triumph upon the fourth centenary of their martyrdom; and has laid its hand on Dom Quentin, Abbot of S. Girolamo, who has died, on February 4th, after guiding the labours of the *Historical Section* to their successful conclusion.

Thereafter, the Pope welcomed the present glorification of the martyrs as the Roman Pontiff's repayment of an ancient debt

to champions of the supremacy of the Roman See. Speaking of the historic device of his old See of Milan, the Holy Father explained to his hearers the picture of St. Ambrose flanked by SS. Gervasius and Protasius, whose sacred relics the saint discovered and restored to honour. "Such defenders I ambition," St. Ambrose wrote to his sister, in a letter which describes how SS. Gervasius and Protasius were illustrious for their sanctity and were also universally praised and admired as *men*. "Tales ambio defensores" is the prayer which a former bishop of Milan again makes his own (*Osservatore Romano*, February 11th, 1935).

THE ABSOLUTION OF AN ACCOMPLICE (C. 2367, §2).

The first paragraph of canon 2367 lays down an extreme ecclesiastical sanction: "Absolvens vel fingens absolvere complicem in peccato turpi incurrit ipso facto in excommunicationem specialissimo modo Sedi Apostolicæ reservatam. . . ." Then, to preclude all possibility of evasion, the second paragraph continues: "Eandem excommunicationem non effugit absolvens vel fingens absolvere complicem qui peccatum quidem complicitatis, a quo nondum est absolutus, non confitetur, sed ideo ita se gerit, quia ad id a complice confessario sive directe sive indirecte inductus est." The confessor's responsibility would be *direct*, if, for instance, he had in fact persuaded the penitent to omit all mention of the sin, on the ground that the confessor already knew; *indirect*, if he had passively allowed the penitent to make his confession in this way.

We should have a similar case if a confessor were to persuade an accomplice that what has been done is not a grave sin, and so need not be confessed; and were then to receive the confession of other sins and give absolution. The case aptly illustrates the special difficulty which is met by the new decree. For if the penitent had been persuaded *before the act* that there was no question of serious sin, his guilt, like that of a child or a lunatic, is only materially, not formally grave; and there is consequently no question of formal complicity in serious sin. Canonists therefore held that the excommunication laid down in canon 2367 could not extend to such a case. From the standpoint of the law, however, this was clearly unsatisfactory. Every principle of religion and morality made it desirable that so grave a misuse of the priestly office should be visited with severe penalties. Hence an authentic interpretation now brings the case definitely within the scope of canon 2367.

The question and response are as follows: "An inter *indirecte inducentes*, de quibus in canone 2367, par. 2, Codicis iuris canonici, adnumerandus etiam sit confessarius qui sive intra sive extra confessionem sacramentalem, alicui persuaserit in turpibus inter se patrandis aut nullum aut certe non grave inesse peccatum eumque consequenter, de aliis tantum sibi postea confitentem sacramentaliter absolvit vel fingit absolvere."

R. "*Affirmative*, facto verbo cum Ssmo" (A.A.S., XXVI, p. 634).

BOOK REVIEWS

The Irish Volunteers and Catholic Emancipation. By Rev. Patrick Rogers, M.A., D.Lit. (Burns Oates & Washbourne. 12s. 6d. net.)

It is a general opinion that an Englishman or Irishman who undertakes to write Irish history, especially of the last four hundred years, has a difficult task before him. Can he reach that degree of aloofness from bias and prejudice that is so essential to an impartial survey and appraisal of past events? The fathers have eaten sour grapes, whichever way one looks at it; and the teeth of the children are expected to be on edge. Be this as it may, the author of the book before us relates an episode in the history of his ancestors, in which bigotry, intolerance and tyranny are the chief villains, without showing signs of atavistic toothache. His narrative of facts, his comments thereon build themselves up into an edifice that has all the severe dignity, the passionless grace of a Doric temple. Even when he is describing the social and political conditions of Irish Catholics in the eighteenth century, he allows others, mostly Protestant witness, to tell the sordid tale, adding a few statistics here and there in the interests of sobriety; while he himself is rather the emotionless scene-shifter, carefully arranging a background for the spectators.

Dr. Rogers, who is a professor at St. Malachy's College, Belfast, reviews from a fresh angle the history of the famous Irish Volunteers. Although the Volunteers owed their origin to the fear of foreign invasion, actually their ultimate object was political, namely, the achievement of Parliamentary reform, especially in the matter of popular representation. The Irish Parliament was entirely Protestant; the heads and most of the rank-and-file of the Volunteers were Protestant. But no honest Irishman in those days could touch the merest fringe of electoral reform, without realizing at once that some consideration would have to be given to the totally disenfranchised Catholics, who numbered four-fifths of the population. Consequently, the "Catholic Question" donned the Volunteers' correspondence and at their deliberations and conventions. Their Conservative leaders, like Lord Charlemont, the commander-in-chief, were only too conscious of the anomaly that was pitted against their fellow-countrymen, but they hesitated to give them the franchise, lest concession should embolden them to enlarge their demands. Others, like the swashbuckling Earl-Bishop of Derry, were "whole-hoggers" in their willingness to alleviate the Catholic position. Others, again, held a middle position between these extremes.

Dr. Rogers, with an attention to detail that is never tedious, describes the reactions of the Protestants to the political doctrine

of Catholic Emancipation, as preached by the Volunteers. These latter are the heroes of his tale. Ulstermen, most of them, they refused to let the question be shelved, in spite of intrigues that worked against them. In the end they were successful; the Catholic Relief Act of 1793 was largely due to their exertions, and to those of the United Irishmen, their political offspring. But their triumph was their doom. The Catholics, more than satisfied with the relief granted to them by Parliament, ceased to support them. Public opinion began to eye them askance, looking upon them as revolutionaries of the hated French type. The Government had no difficulty in constitutionally disbanding them, "but their spirit, the spirit of justice and toleration, lived on in the United Irishmen." It may be added, too, that their glorious memory revives in the industrious and illuminating tribute which Dr. Rogers pays to them.

J. R. MEAGHER.

The Challenge of Christ. By Fr. James, O.M.Cap., M.A., Ph.D., D.Litt. (Burns Oates & Washbourne. pp. xi. and 180. 5s.)

This latest book from the prolific pen of Fr. James consists of a series of lectures addressed to the students of University College, Dublin. It is a little severer than some of his former books, but it still carries the charm of his rich imaginative writing. The philosopher and diligent student of St. Thomas are always to the fore in anything that Fr. James writes, but more conspicuous here is the direct and plain statement of dogmatic truth.

The lectures on the Immaculate Conception and on the Trinity are particularly good. Equally striking, though in different vein, is the lecture on the position of woman in the Christian dispensation. A whole chapter is devoted to Communism, and the final chapter shows how the Kingship of Christ is calculated to countervail this sinister influence and that of secularism generally.

T. E. F.

Readings and Addresses. By Fr. F. H. Drinkwater. (Burns Oates & Washbourne. 5s.)

The first half of this book consists of readings for the Holy Hour. Sometimes, as in *Gethsemane*, they are largely a series of appropriate scripture texts; at other times Our Lord's message is delivered in words imagined as coming from His divine lips; and again we have a short sermon. There are some excellent meditations for the Rosary which will suggest others to any priest, and such a variation on the Manual of Prayers' meditations make a welcome change. Finally, Fr. Drinkwater gives us some excellent short sermons which could be preached as they stand.

T. E. F.

THE CHURCH AT HOME AND ABROAD

I. ROME.

BY THE REV. RICHARD L. SMITH, Ph.D., M.A.

The carabinieri are discarding their lovely Napoleonic hats, which always gave an air of Ruritania to our streets, and taking, instead, to dull peaked caps, like any other militarists. This is regrettable. These engaging hats, with the tricolour cockade, green, white and red, were hard to associate with anything so sordid as an arrest. And what will they wear on gala days? Before, they used to put a stocky plume in their hats, an affair which changed from red to blue in the middle, like an exciting ice. It is a pity that efficiency should make for dull uniformity. I do not suppose that the three-cornered hats had anything to recommend them to their wearers: they were hot and heavy and hard, and gave no shade worth the name. And yet we, who did not have to wear them, liked to see them on other heads. With the carozza drivers, and the bus men, and the *metropolitani*—when not on traffic duty—all in similar peaked caps, much of the spice of variety is gone out of life. It is sad to see the Italians succumbing: after all, it was their own proverb which Queen Elizabeth loved to quote—*per molto variare la natura è bella*. Only the postman have survived these changes: they still go about in their dirty grey drill, a hideous costume, which we all despised until to-day. But, now, at least their headgear is not quite like everybody else's. I had forgotten the smart forage cap of Fascist officers, with one, long continuous tassel falling over the crown, like the crest of a breaking wave. And then the Bersaglieri have still got their welter of feathers, like a cock on one side. Perhaps things are not so bad after all. But why have they done away with the Napoleonic-cornered-hats? Someone will be wanting to put the Swiss Guards in field-grey. The Italian sun was created by Almighty God to make the most of all the colour on earth. Some day it will start shining in the half-hearted way it does in England, and the blame will be Italy's.

* * *

The main excitement of the month has been, of course, the progress of the cause of Blessed John Fisher and Blessed Thomas More. At the end of December appeared the big, red volume in which the Postulancy made out their case for the Canonization. All of it is interesting, but especially the magnificent votum of Monsignor Natucci, the Promotor Fidei, which instead of making difficulties, ends with the suggestion that the canonization should be solemnized with all possible splendour. "Attamen,

cum binae ad metam patent viae, condecet omnino nobilior eligatur; deteriore enim sequi, nisi cogentes adsint causae, illiberalitatem saperet, in eos praesertim qui liberaliter sanguinem profuderunt pro suprema Romani Pontificis auctoritate." There are also some eighty fascinating pages of excerpts from English, French, German, Dutch and other writers, beginning with contemporary verdicts and coming right up to our own day. It is marvellous evidence of the veneration in which More and Fisher are held by men of every political and religious persuasion. And the list could be added to. For instance, the eloquent tribute of *The Times* on February 2nd did honour not only to the martyrs but to the paper which printed it. This article has made a great impression here in Rome, and other newspapers have written in equally generous, if not in equally measured, terms.

One result of the now famous general congregation of the Rites on January 29th was that the stream of petitions, which had fallen to a steady trickle, suddenly burst again into spate. Over three hundred letters arrived on the 28th, and how many signatures these represent I do not yet know. But perhaps the most striking feature of the whole business is that scarcely a day has passed since the beginning of December without the delivery of one or two petitions. And still they come. Specimens of the earlier letters occupy over 260 pages of the *Positivo*, and they, of course, are a fraction only of the total.

The meeting of the 29th is famous for the number who attended it: ten out of eleven Cardinals came—Cardinals Laurenti (Prefect of the S.C. of Rites), Belmonte, Gasparri, Bisleti, Lépicier, Segura y Saenz, Rossi (Proposer of the Cause), Serafini, Dolci and Verde. The Consultors were headed by Abbot Quentin, whose tragic death has since cast a gloom over Rome. The general air of excitement was unmistakable. The outstanding figures whose martyrdom was to be discussed and the unique nature of the proposed procedure accounted for this. The Sala del Trono had been arranged for the session. A vast table occupied most of the room, and at the far end a small table, raised on a platform, was prepared for the Holy Father. He came in promptly at ten o'clock in rochet and mozzetta: the Cardinals and other Consultors hurried in, the door was shut, and a Noble Guard with drawn sword took up his post in front of the red baize. I was left, with Father Agostino, the Postulator, and the two Avvocati, to kick my heels outside and to realize, quite suddenly, that I was the only Englishman among all these people.

Once the door is closed the proceedings begin under oath of secrecy. This is a serious business. One of the Cardinals was unexpectedly detained and arrived some ten minutes late. The Noble Guard was not at all inclined to let him enter, and a long dialogue took place with the Master of Ceremonies inside before the door was at length opened, and the Cardinal went through. Then we waited. I thought of all the prayers that had been

offere
impo
the
Card
all,
minu
of R
vibra
Guar
unde
my l
mean
past
was
the
beyo
his v
exul
one
Pad
Y
Mon
ever
that
on
befo
Fat
he
the
libr
life
pre
Ort
Bie
pub
étre
suj
de
tro
tex
lat

sit
bel
lik
Br
on
ra
to
so

offered up in England for a favourable verdict—surely it was impossible that anything should go wrong now. About 11.45 the Consultors came out, leaving the Pope alone with his Cardinals. They all smiled encouragingly at us; but that was all, and our vigil went on. The clock crept from minute to minute. The gun on the Janiculum at midday set all the bells of Rome jangling, and the deep tones of Saint Peter's chimes vibrated in the Vatican: half-past twelve, one o'clock. The Guards, usually a phlegmatic people, had now caught the general undercurrent of excitement at this long session. I was doing my best to explain to them something of what Fisher and More meant to us, meant to the whole world too. Then at a quarter-past one the Guard by the door suddenly turned to listen—there was the scraping of chairs and he flung open the door to show the Cardinals all standing. We raced through them to the room beyond, and in a minute the Holy Father came through on his way to his apartments. He looked hot and tired but obviously exultant: he gave us a warm blessing, and as we stood up, one of the Avvocati burst out: "Ma com' è allegro il Santo Padre—si vede che tutt' è andato begnissimo!"

You had the news on the wireless almost as soon as we. Monsignor Natucci was received in audience on the Friday evening, and the Pope told him of his favourable decision and that the decree *de vero martyrio* should be read in the Vatican on Sunday, February 10th. It is a pity that I have to write before that date—it will be interesting to hear what the Holy Father has to say about Fisher and More. I wonder whether he will mention a fact which he revealed for the first time, to the best of my knowledge, a few days ago. When he was librarian at the Ambrosiana, in Milan, he discovered a Latin life of Fisher. He had hopes of editing it himself: but the press of work prevented it and so he handed it over to Fr. Van Ortro, S.J., the Bollandist, who issued the classic *Vie du Bienheureux Martyr, Jean Fisher, Cardinal, Evêque de Rochester*, published in 1893. The author thus refers to this find: "Peut-être trouvera-t-on qu'un étranger n'aurait pas dû toucher à un sujet, qui pénètre si intimement dans la vie religieuse et sociale de l'Angleterre du XVI^e siècle. . . . Mais cet étranger s'est trouvé dans des conditions favorables pour étudier de près le texte anglais et en éclaircir la composition par un nouveau texte latin, découvert en Italie."

I have not left myself much space to comment on the political situation, but this is of little importance since, for the time being, interest has swung from Rome to London, and now seems likely to be transferred to Berlin. The agreement between the British Government on one side and MM. Flandin and Laval on the other is welcomed here in Italy, principally for the fact, rather than for the points, of agreement. These are considered to be of secondary importance besides the extension of the area, so to speak, of peace-making. To my own mind the vital aspects

of this new accord are that French security and German equality are to be negotiated concurrently; that the revision of Versailles is being squarely faced, at least in those articles which concern German re-armament; and that Germany is to be a free party to the discussions. It is not a scheme to be taken or left, whole and entire, by Germany. The danger is that France may be inclined so to consider it. If Germany will not have it, a new scheme will have to be framed *ab initio*. Any plan to which Germany is not a willing party will never work. How far this all fits in with Mussolini's consistent policy of the last few years will be plain to anyone who has taken the trouble to follow these notes regularly. But what will Germany do? Goebel's references to Memel and to Austria in a recent paper are ominous. And the Saar may still prove a problem despite the definite result of the plebiscite. There is still much work for England and Italy to do before peace is assured, and anyone who would keep England out of her share in peacemaking by creating a bogey of continental commitments is criminally short-sighted. If only on the ground of trade recovery, we need a prosperous Europe and America is to take our goods. And surely there are yet higher grounds for refusing to be stampeded into a selfish and stupid policy of isolation.

II. ENGLAND.

BY THE REV. T. E. FLYNN, Ph.D., M.A.

It has long been discussed wherever priests have been gathered together, why this country, which was once the Island of Saints, has not had a saint canonized for so many centuries. The contrast between the countries on the two sides of the English Channel is striking and disconcerting. France, Italy and Spain have seen hundred of their peoples, priests, nuns and layfolk raised to the full honours of the altar, while we could not produce a single saint; and that, in spite of the heroism of those who died for the faith in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries or were confessors stripped of all short of life itself for the same faith. By some it was put down to the influences of the Reformation and the chilling atmosphere of Protestantism; Englishmen were not sufficiently eager, they did not pray hard enough, or there was not amongst us that warmth of devotion in which sanctity flourishes. It was always perhaps rather futile to try to ascertain the *why* of the dispositions of God in this matter, except in so far as we might learn to correct anything that might be amiss in us. Anyhow we now see the term of this national eclipse. We are to have our saints in the persons of the glorious martyrs, St. John Fisher and St. Thomas More. Let us see to it that the occasion does not catch us unawares. Our people are too unfamiliar with the significance of the function that is to take place in St. Peter's in May. But the Catholic Press, and the clergy in the pulpit or on the platform are doing their best to arouse them to the importance

of celebrating the great occasion with all due solemnity and magnificence.¹ There will doubtless be a large concourse of pilgrims to Rome for the Canonization and all great Catholic interests and societies will be represented there.

* * * *

Catholics are now grouped according to their trades or professions in a multitude of guilds which are doing a great work for the Church in this country. Here it may be appropriate to notice two or three of those which are more particularly intellectual in their activities. Everyone knows of the well established Guild of SS. Luke, Cosmas and Damian which with its English headquarters in London has branches all over Great Britain and in Ireland. Its quarterly magazine, *The Catholic Medical Guardian*, is widely read in the profession and among the clergy.

A smaller but very active group is the Society of Sir Thomas More, the members of which are barristers, who meet frequently during term time for the reading and discussion of papers on matters of Catholic interest. During the month of February they heard a paper on Sir Thomas More's influence in England by Professor R. W. Chambers who has written so eloquently on this subject in his *Continuity of English Prose*.

Some years ago, on reviewing a book by Mr. Arnold Lunn who had expressed amazement that Catholics were on the whole so little interested in St. Thomas of Aquin, I drew attention to the existence of a society in London, whose members devoted themselves to the diligent study of St. Thomas. Since then the Aquinas Society has flourished exceedingly. They provide a monthly lecture in Burlington House, Piccadilly, which is open free to members and their friends. A perusal of its programme for the year will show how seriously they devote themselves to their study of sound (not to say Catholic) philosophy, and readers of this REVIEW have had opportunities of observing how widely and into what unexpected quarters their influence has spread. They announce for this summer a retreat to be given by the famous Thomist, Père Garrigou Lagrange, O.P.

During the past year a full time chaplain was appointed to take charge of the Catholics in the University of London. As there are some seven hundred Catholic members of the University this appointment met an obvious need. The chaplain, Dr. David Mathew, D.Litt., M.A., has a house in Woburn Square with a chapel and rooms for social meetings. Under the auspices of this Catholic society Mgr. Noël, the President of the Institute of Philosophy in Louvain, will give a lecture on "Le Réalisme de S. Thomas" on March 12th, in the Botanical Theatre of University College.

¹ The Editors have arranged a special Martyrs' number for the month of May.

III. FRANCE.

BY DENIS GWYNN, D.Litt., F.R.Hist.S.

Cardinal Andrieu's death removes a characteristic and impressive survivor of a vanished age, whose influence was still very important after the War. He was born in 1849, in the diocese of Toulouse, and although he will be remembered chiefly as the Archbishop of Bordeaux, nearly two-thirds of his long life was spent elsewhere. He was ordained in 1874, and in the following year he was chosen by Cardinal Desprez, the Archbishop of Toulouse, to be his secretary, and very soon afterwards was made a Canon. He was little more than thirty when he was appointed Vicar-General for Toulouse in 1880, and for twenty-one years he was the principal administrator of that important diocese with its large city population. In 1901 the see of Marseilles fell vacant and Canon Andrieu was appointed its bishop, Marseilles being then, as now, the second city of France in size and commercial importance. There he remained as bishop for seven years, and in 1907, as Bishop of Marseilles, he was made a Cardinal by Pius X. In the following year he was translated from Marseilles to Bordeaux, as Archbishop and Primate of Aquitaine. Bordeaux itself was not nearly so large a city, but its conditions as a great sea-port were very similar to those which he had known for years both in Toulouse and in Marseilles, and he proceeded to organize and develop the see with the same energy and devotion.

In the Great War he was never so conspicuous, because Bordeaux was remote from the battlefields, as Cardinal Amette in Paris or the heroic Cardinal Luçon who remained in his bombarded city for four years while the German trenches surrounded its outskirts. But the War affected his province as profoundly as any other, and one of his most remarkable priests was the Abbé Bergey, parish priest of St. Emilion, who afterwards became one of the chief organizers of the ex-soldier priests and of the National Catholic Federation, which was formed under General de Castelnau's leadership to oppose the revival of anti-clerical policies under Herriot's Government in 1924. Cardinal Andrieu was already seventy when the Peace Treaty was signed. He had always been a strict disciplinarian, and the Gironde, where he lived for nearly thirty years after his return from Marseilles to Bordeaux, had always shown a liking for strong men. Among others, it produced Emile Combes, whose fierce anti-clericalism was reinforced by a Napoleonic attitude in politics. The Cardinal, both at Marseilles and at Bordeaux (which is one of the least active of Catholic centres in France), had resolutely defied Combes and his successors and their laws against the Church and the religious orders; and he had long asserted his right of leadership on the Church's side. His personal qualities were to count unexpectedly in a famous conflict after the War.

The younger generation, in France as in other countries, were

bitterly disillusioned by democratic government, and the propaganda in favour of a monarchy, which was so skilfully and eloquently conducted by Charles Maurras and Léon Daudet, made many thousands of converts in the universities, and especially among the younger clergy and in the seminaries. Cardinal Andrieu was a staunch upholder of the old traditions, which in France had always identified the Republic with anti-clericalism. But he had no sympathy with the intellectual revival of royalist ideas by the *Action Française*. It was as active in Aquitaine as elsewhere, and the old aristocratic families believed, after the War, that the royalists were to have their day again. They threw all their influence in favour of *Action Française* candidates, even when they could only hope to prevent the return of Catholic democrats or moderates who were pledged to oppose anti-clerical legislation.

But Cardinal Andrieu had already made his own decisions concerning the elections, and the *Action Française* in many cases defeated his plans. Conflict between them had become acute when the question of condemning the *Action Française* movement was being urged strongly on the Holy See. Many Catholics in all parts of France had been protesting that the Church was being exploited for party politics, and that in the industrial districts particularly every church was being turned into an arena where royalist demonstrations were staged under a religious guise. Similar protests had been sent to Rome before the War, and Pius X, who was decidedly sympathetic to the *Action Française* because of its campaign against the modernists, had been deeply impressed by the case laid before him. He had, in fact—although this was still quite unknown—signed a formal condemnation of the *Action Française*, but reserved its publication until need should arise. The whole world had changed since his death in 1914, and the question was being reviewed in Rome under quite different conditions in 1923. But the reigning Pontiff decided that at last the movement must, for various reasons, be condemned and the method of launching the condemnation had to be decided. The present writer has been told on the authority of persons who were directly concerned in urging the condemnation on the Holy See, that several of the French Cardinals were approached and asked if they would take the first step. The late Cardinal Charost, who had been Bishop of Lille before his promotion as Archbishop of Rennes and Primate of Brittany, is said to have declined chiefly because the old royalists were so strong in Brittany. But eventually the first move came from Bordeaux, when Cardinal Andrieu published in his diocesan gazette a long and considered "reply to certain young persons who had asked whether they should join the *Action Française*."

Cardinal Andrieu's letter was an elaborate document, which surveyed the whole question with a long array of quotations from books, pamphlets and articles attributed to Maurras and Daudet and other leaders of the movement. It might easily

have escaped notice, but the surprising prominence it received showed that it was intended for much wider consumption. The *Action Française* newspaper, which then had a national and vigorous circulation, replied at once, and within a few weeks a tremendous controversy was raging. The Pope soon intervened with a letter of approval to Cardinal Andrieu; and before long the Holy Father announced publicly that the Cardinal's letter was to be placed among the official documents in the case, and that it had the Pope's absolute and unqualified support. The controversy has since passed into history, and the wisdom of the Holy See's condemnation has been abundantly justified on many grounds. Even the recent revival of anti-democratic sentiment in France has not availed to galvanize the movement into effective life, after the shattering blow which it received. M. Maurras himself is already a very old man, and the movement which owed so much to his extraordinary talents and his personal magnetism is not likely to survive him long.

But it should be said quite frankly—and especially in loyalty to the Holy See—that Cardinal Andrieu's letter which launched the attack was deplorably careless in many of its statements. Several of his quotations were so glaringly inaccurate that the *Action Française* soon offered very large sums to anybody who could prove them to be true, and they had to be withdrawn. There was no difficulty in showing that the old Cardinal had derived much of his information from hostile pamphlets, published in Belgium, which were sent to him by interested persons and that he repeated certain inaccuracies which these pamphlets contained. His letter was apparently written and published without any adequate revision by experts in the controversy. It offered many easy opportunities for crushing repartee by the exponents of the *Action Française*, and it gave colour to their main contention that the Pope had condemned the movement as a result of misleading and interested information to which they had no chance to reply before the attack began.

Had the Cardinal's letter been properly edited before publication a great deal of the subsequent controversy need never have arisen, and a great deal of heartburning among sincere Catholic royalists would have been avoided. But in its main contentions the Cardinal's letter stated the case against the *Action Française* with great clarity and force. The indiscretion involved the Holy Father in the necessity of devoting far more attention to the controversy than should have been required. But he will always be remembered as the courageous old Cardinal who did not hesitate to undertake a most unpleasant and unenviable task; and the new generation are largely indebted to him for having helped to show that the Church in France is not allied to any political tradition, and that a Catholic can be a loyal democrat in France or any other country. His long experience in the great commercial cities, where the Church had largely lost its hold among the working class and the

bourgeoisie, and where the Catholic revival had to be organized with special attention to modern conditions, had given him an outlook different from that of many of his contemporaries.

It was a very graceful action on the part of Mgr. Gerlier to announce publicly that the idea of holding the triduum to conclude the Holy Year at Lourdes originated with Cardinal Bourne. The special correspondent of *La Croix* at Lourdes has published fuller details, collected from official sources, which deserve to be recorded here: "It was an English priest of Belgian origin," he writes, "Father Waterkeyn, a faithful friend of France, who has been entrusted in his country with the Mass crusade, who first conceived the idea that the Holy Year should close with a triduum of Masses celebrated through three days and nights. He proposed the idea to H.E. Cardinal Bourne, who gave it unhesitating encouragement, and added that 'Such a triduum ought to take place at the Grotto of Lourdes.' Neither Father Waterkeyn nor the great Cardinal were men who could fail to pursue the fulfilment of their plan promptly and with resolution. So the Archbishop of Westminster wrote to H.E. Cardinal Verdier to ask his co-operation in requesting of the Holy Father the extraordinary favour of which he and one of his clergy had thought. Needless to say, the Archbishop of Paris received the invitation with enthusiasm, and, as he happened to be in Lourdes, he sent his request to the Holy Father from there. Some time afterwards the Cardinal Secretary of State replied, in a notable letter, that the Pope not only approved wholeheartedly of the idea which had been submitted to him, but desired to reserve for himself the appropriate moment for a personal pronouncement. The intervention of His Holiness was to take shape in the eloquent letter, in his own handwriting, sent by him to Mgr. Gerlier, of which we have already published the text. Moreover, the Bishop of Lourdes, who went to Rome at the end of last year to thank the Father of all the faithful for his reception of the plan, had also received a most touching approval of it and an assurance that the Holy Father was extremely happy to agree to the wishes of the Cardinal Archbishops of Westminster and Paris."

Two recent changes at the *Académie Française* deserve notice. A few years ago the Catholic group within the Academy, who gave constant and generous support to all religious activities, included two extremely devout Catholics, the novelist René Bazin and the historian Pierre de la Gorce. René Bazin's place was filled by the election of M. Georges Lenotre, a brilliant historian of the French Revolution, whose real name was Theodore Gosselin. He continued the work of Taine in exposing the true character of many of the revolutionary heroes, while his remarkable power of bringing a whole period to life by presenting detailed studies of its principal actors gained a very wide public for his books. M. Lenotre has died suddenly in Paris, and the gap since René Bazin's death is thus further widened. M. Pierre de la Gorce was one of a still older school,

who had taken to historical studies nearly fifty years ago, when he resigned his position in the magistrature as a protest against anti-clerical legislation which would have required him to act against his conscience. He subsequently produced a series of massive volumes covering the religious history of the French Revolution, which have since become the standard works on the subject. His place has now been filled by a much younger man, the Duc de Broglie, whose distinction has been won in scientific research, particularly in connection with X-rays. As successor of Pierre de la Gorce he had to deliver the customary address in tribute to his career, and the Duke's elegant and impressive panegyric did full justice to the fervour and unostentatious devotion of his Catholic faith. The Duke's reception was notable also for other reasons. It was the first time these formal proceedings at the Academy were broadcast on the wireless; and the address of welcome to the Duke had been prepared by M. Louis Barthou only a few days before his assassination at Marseilles. The address was consequently read by M. Paléologue.

IV. CENTRAL EUROPE.

BY C. F. MELVILLE.

Germany and the Concordat.

Hopes that the regulation of the relations between Catholics and the Nazi Régime, in accordance with the Concordat, would be proceeded with by the New Year, have not been fulfilled.

At the moment there is a heated struggle between the Nazis and the Catholics in Bavaria on the question of Catholic schools. The Nazi authorities had ordained that parents had to register those of their children coming of school age by April 1st, either for entry into the denominational schools (Catholic, Protestant or Jewish) or the undenominational schools. Propaganda on either side was forbidden in theory, but in practice it only applied to the denominational side, for propaganda was issued by the Mayor of Munich, the President of the Deutsche Schulgemeinde, and the Hitler Youth Regional Leader. In spite of this, however, no less than sixty-five per cent. of the Catholic parents registered their children for entry into the Catholic denominational schools.

This is a remarkable tribute to the courage and fortitude of the Catholic parents. For not only did they have to withstand propaganda from the State political party organizations, while their own organization had to remain silent, but they had in addition to face the problem that children educated in the undenominational schools would have better chances for securing good positions after leaving school than would those educated in the denominational schools. For that is the situation in Germany to-day. Theoretically all are equal before the law. Actually, those associated with the Nazi youth

and party organizations get preferment. Nevertheless, the great majority of the Catholic parents have stood firm.

Cardinal Faulhaber, the fearless Munich Prelate, has made representations to Berlin and at the Vatican, complaining of a breach of Article 23 of the Concordat, which guarantees "the maintenance of the Catholic Confessional schools and the opening of new ones."

Cardinal Faulhaber has protested on three counts, and it is reported that the Vatican has accordingly made formal representations of protest to Berlin. The three matters which are the subject of the protest are as follows: The prohibition by the authorities of a church meeting at which the clergy were to speak, the confiscation of the Cardinal's pastoral letter, and the taking over of Catholic schools by Nazis. The Cardinal has also protested against the recent molestation and temporary arrest of his secretary.

The Nazi organization, the Deutsche Schulgemeinde, supported by S.A. Stormtroopers and S.S. Guards, has been conducting a campaign of considerable violence against the Cardinal, and at a recent meeting there were menacing cries against him, coupled with accusations—which are, of course, completely false—to the effect that he was trying to revive the political influence of the (now disbanded) Centrum, the one-time Catholic Party.

The violence with which the anti-Catholic campaign is again being conducted, especially in regard to the schools in Bavaria, is symptomatic of two things: (1) the renewed attempts of Herr Rosenberg and his friends of the pagan, extreme Nazi cult to gain the intellectual control of youth; and (2) the tendency of the authorities to permit the extreme Nazi elements to have their own way in religious and cultural matters in order to distract their attention from the gradual lessening of their power in economic and political questions.

In the realms of high politics, economics, finance and national defence the Radical Nazi elements have been gradually eliminated from positions of influence, and their place taken by more orthodox and conservative elements. To sugar the pill of this gradual elimination, however, the Radical Nazi elements are being allowed to make themselves felt in other directions; hence the revival of the anti-Semitic campaign; and the intensification of the campaign against the Catholic Church, as exemplified by the new Nazi attack on the Catholic schools.

Austria.

How different is the situation in regard to the Catholic schools in Austria! In this connection, as a writer in the *Christliche Ständestaat*, Dr. Hans Pernter, observes, the Austrian schools now contribute to the resurrection of Christian culture. With the removal, by the Dollfuss régime, of the previous Socialist decree prohibiting religious instruction,

there took place the re-Christianizing of the Austrian school system. Crucifixes have returned to the class-rooms. Religious instruction now takes place not only in the ordinary schools, but also in the commercial and trade schools.

The writer also refers to the Government decree whereby provision has been made for the patriotic education of youth, including the revision of reading and history books, the issue of patriotic badges and school flags and the holding of patriotic school festivals.

In this connection, it may be added, that whereas in Germany the attitude of the State party, National-Socialism, implies, by its attacks on the Church, that patriotism and religion are opposed, in Austria the attitude of the State party, the Patriotic Front, implies that patriotism and religion go together.

The *Christliche Ständestaat* also has some interesting things to say about the recent attempts of the Government to open informal *pourparlers* with the Austrian Nazis. The paper is critical of these attempts. It supports the Schuschnigg-Starhemberg Government, and it claims that this support is none the less wholehearted if from time to time it makes criticisms on certain points of detail. It expresses the opinion, therefore, that while the general policy of the Government is admirable in every way, it was a mistake on the part of the Government to seek any kind of *modus vivendi* with the Nazis. It calls for a policy of a "hundred per cent. Austrianism" as being in the best interests both of Austria in particular and of German Christian culture in general.

The paper pays a warm tribute to Prince Starhemberg, in connection with a recent speech made by the Prince, in which he declared that never could Austria forget the 20th July (the assassination of Dollfuss), and that never must there be any compromise. This the *Christliche Ständerstaat* hails as the expression of the "clear will of the Schuschnigg-Starhemberg Government." Prince Starhemberg, the paper adds, has developed from a young party leader into a great patriotic leader, and no praise is too high for his courage in admitting his past mistakes (this, evidently referring to his enthusiasm in earlier days for pan-Germanism and Nazism; an enthusiasm which, during recent years, he has entirely outgrown; for the Prince to-day is resolutely opposed even to a compromise with Nazism).

At all events, as I explained in the last issue of this REVIEW, the informal talks between the Government and the Nazis were never intended to go further than an exploration of the ground. Further than this they did not go. Now they have been discontinued.

About the time these lines appear in print Herr von Schuschnigg, the Chancellor, accompanied by the Foreign Minister, Baron Berger-Waldenegg, will be in London, on an

official visit to the British Government. They will visit the French Government in Paris, before they come to London.

Herr von Schuschnigg and Baron Berger-Waldeneegg will have a number of important questions to discuss with British Ministers, in regard to the Austrian situation, especially in connection with the recent Franco-Italian consultative agreement, to which Britain now adheres, for the maintenance of Austrian independence.

Yugoslavia.

Mgr. Anton Bauer, Archbishop of Zagreb, and prelate of Croatia, celebrated on the 11th February his eightieth birthday.

The Catholic paper, *Hrvatska Straza*, writes that Mgr. Bauer occupied with dignity his place in the line of prelates who, from the first Bishop, Mgr. Duh, to Mgr. Bauer's predecessor, Mgr. Poselovitch, had brought lustre to the See of Zagreb by the holiness of their lives and their apostolic zeal.

Ordained priest in 1879, Mgr. Bauer taught at the University for twenty-three years, becoming Dean and rector, and in 1911 he became coadjutor to Mgr. Poselovitch, whom he succeeded as Archbishop in 1914.

A great defender of the rights of the Church, the Archbishop had re-animated the spiritual life of Croatia. He founded Catholic Action, outside party politics, and developed the seminaries. The late King Alexander held Mgr. Bauer in high esteem, and, amongst other signs of his sympathy, had conferred upon him the distinction of the highest Yugoslav decoration, the Grand Cross of Karadjordje.

REVIEWS FROM ABROAD

The February ECCLESIASTICAL REVIEW has a number of interesting articles. Dr. Peter Guilday, the well-known historian, writes on "Historians in the American Hierarchy"; contrary to the general impression, there have been many episcopal authors of this kind. In "Who wrote the 'Adoro Te'?" Mgr. MacMahon discusses the verdict of Dom A. Wilmart rejecting the Thomistic origin of the hymn. He cites much evidence in rebuttal and quotes Père Mandonnet: "The prayer is signed by a Thomistic hand." In "The Morality of Certain Operations" Dom T. V. Moore, O.S.B., himself a doctor of medicine, decides that, where Cæsarean section cannot be performed, there is the possibility of a conservative cranial operation which "would not be a direct killing of the child but an attempt to save its life." An article of cognate interest "The Birth Control Platform," by Dom Damian Cummins, O.S.B., considers the various forms that birth control propaganda takes in the United States.

The second (February) issue of THE NEW REVIEW (published by Macmillan & Co., at 294, Bow Bazaar Street, Calcutta) has many articles of more than Indian interest. P. J. Thomas writes on "The Menace of Over-Population"; Fr. A. Verstraeten, S.J., in "The Philosophy of Science," determines "The New World-Picture of Modern Physics" in the light of books by Sir James Jeans and Mgr. Sheen. Fr. Vincent McNabb in "Francis de Victoria and International Law" maintains with a great American jurist that not Grotius but Victoria was the true father of modern international law. Fr. H. Heras, S.J., concludes his informing articles on "The Jesuits in Afghanistan." The suppression of the Society was the end of their efforts in Afghanistan; after the re-establishment in 1814 no further opportunity of visiting the country occurred. "A Political Note Book" by "Publius" gives a balanced criticism of the report of the Joint Select Committee on India.

In the January number of ANGELICUM, Père Garrigou-Lagrange, O.P., prints his inaugural discourse, delivered at the Collegio Angelico on November 15th, on "Le sens du mystère chez Cajetan." He proves that the prince of logicians, the most subtle of Thomistic theologians, was not misled, for all his learning, into an attempt to diminish the great mysteries of faith. Cajetan was one of those "(qui) savent qu'on peut toujours approfondir ces raisons de convenance sans jamais les transformer en démonstration. . . ." The author examines the chief aspects of Cajetan's doctrine on God and the divine attributes, on God and the divine relations, and on the mystery of predestination. On the last point Cajetan writes: "Meum est tenere quod mihi certum est . . . et expectare ut videam in

patria mysterium divinae electionis mihi modo ignotum, sicut et reliqua fidei mysteria. *Haec ignorantia quietat intellectum meum.*" This, writes Père Garrigou, is "le docte ignorance qui s'unit à la contemplation de Dieu." The whole article is a magnificent tribute by one of the greatest of modern Thomists to his master in the adroit handling of arguments. P. A. Blat concludes his valuable series on "De Confessariis Religiosorum" and P. S. Zarb continues his Augustinian studies with "Chronologia Enarrationum S. Augustini in Psalmos." As usual, a large part of the periodical is given to reviews, which are very well done.

In the October-December number of ECHOS D'ORIENT, there are, as usual, a number of highly technical articles. One, at least, is of some general interest to those with a knowledge of the Near East. It is J. Deslandes' "Sources canoniques de Droit oriental." The bodies discussed are the Maronites, Nestorians, Chaldeans, Copts, Ethiopians, and Malabarese. The Chronicle of the Eastern Churches by J. Lacombe is, as ordinarily, full of useful matter.

LA VIE SPIRITUELLE for February is a number that explains the great popularity of this excellent periodical. In "La Mystique du mariage chrétien," J.-A. Robilliard gives a practical commentary on Ephes. v. 22-32. The spirituality of the Apostolic Fathers is treated by M. Gustave Bardy, who takes for his present subject St. Ignatius of Antioch. Père Garrigou-Lagrange studies "La vie intérieure de Mère Marie de Jésus" the foundress of the Daughters of the Heart of Jesus, under the headings "L'oraison contemplative; les vertus solides et la fidélité à la grâce à l'exemple de Marie; l'union à l'oblation de Notre-Seigneur à la sainte Messe." There is a stimulating plea by Père Lajeunie "Pour un ordre catholique vivant" ("Je n'accuse pas l'insincérité de notre foi; j'accuse son éternement, son manque absolu de divine ambition").

In the Belgian review LA CITE CHRETIENNE for February 5th there is a fine treatment by the Abbé J. Leclercq of "Catholicisme et cléricalisme." The rest of the number is devoted to social and economic studies.

In the Strasbourg REVUE DES SCIENCES RELIGIEUSES for January, M. Bardy completes his series on "L'Eglise et l'enseignement au IV^e siècle"; his general conclusion is that, during that century, the Church did not pay sufficient attention to the problems of a Christian upbringing for her children; they continued to be occupied with the classical authors and to frequent schools where religion was non-existent. This relative indifference to the type of education given to Christians is absent in the works of SS. Basil, Chrysostom, Jerome and Augustine; already, at the beginning of the fifth century, the solution of the problem is being attempted. There are also, in this number, two articles on Bergsonism. The second by M. A. Vincent, is a careful analysis of *Les deux sources de la*

morale et de la religion, with a consideration of Loisy's criticisms of Bergson in *Y a-t-il deux sources de la religion et de la morale?* The two "Chroniques" are of special value. One, by M. Amann, the editor of the *Dictionnaire de théologie catholique*, concerns early theology; the other, by M. Vaganay, reviews a number of works on New Testament subjects, principally "ouvrages et questions d'introduction générale."

ANTONIANUM, the Roman organ of the Franciscan Friars Minor of the Leonine Union, has in its January number a discussion by P. Antonius Vellico, O.F.M., "De regula fidei juxta Joannis Duns Scoti doctrinam." The author examines Scotus's works to determine the teaching of the Subtle Doctor regarding the relation of Scripture to tradition; his conclusion is that Scotus's doctrine is in complete agreement with the subsequent Tridentine definition. Fr. J. Heerinx supplies a number of texts on the devotion to the Sacred Heart in the writings of Bl. Baptist Varani (1458-1524). Fr. C. Mesini strives to attain to certitude regarding the author and place of composition of the Preface of Our Blessed Lady. He concludes that the author was Urban II and that the place of composition was Piacenza.

THEOLOGIE UND GLAUBE, published at the Bonifacius-Druckerei, Paderborn, has several articles of importance in the January issue. Like many German Catholic periodicals, at the moment it is much occupied with the attempted restoration of Pagan ideals in modern Germany. The first article of this number "Die Begegnung des Germanentums mit dem Christentum" by Professor Herte of Paderborn, proves that Christianity was not introduced into Germany "mit Feuer und Schwert," as the neo-Pagans claim, but was freely accepted by the Germanic peoples. In "Moderne Marienideale," Professor B. Bartmann considers the traces of devotion to Our Lady that are to be found in even the most Protestant surroundings, principally as this is reflected in the survival of legends. In "Die schismatische Propaganda in Karpathorussland," a Czech professor, Dr. J. Hadzega describes the difficult position of Uniate Catholics in the bishopric of Mukacev and the unwise attempts at latinization that led, in some instances, to schism. There is also, among the "Kleine Beiträge," an interesting summary by Dr. Hecht of the growth of legislation regarding the "secretum Sancti Officii."

The Dutch apologetic HET SCHILD in its February number devotes several pages to a notice "Bij den dood van Kardinaal Bourne." A full summary is provided of his Eminence's career, and special attention is paid to the incidents connected with the Eucharistic Congress of 1908 and to the Malines Conversations. Several of the Cardinal's pastorals (notably those of 1924 [Christian Unity] and 1928 [Elizabethan Continuity]) are given in brief outline.

The Belgian review KULTUURLEVEN for January reaches, as usual, a high standard. One may call special attention to the

first a
article
War.
termin

The
aband
runni
issue
the sp
good

THE
No. 4
the v
Béven
Macc
hither

TH
Vienn
a hea
Before
BL
Worl
Aelw
Jou
the v
Hero
by R
PA
Webb

first article on Judaism and Christianity, and to the concluding article by P. Schroons, O.P., on Catholic Moral Teaching and War. Philologists will welcome a study of Dutch scholastic terminology by P. Axters, O.P.

THE RIVISTA DEL CLERO ITALIANO for January appears to have abandoned its last year's policy of having a common subject running through all the articles in a number. The present issue is divided between a series of papers on the priest and the spiritual formation of souls, a discussion on suicide, and a good deal of useful sermon matter.

THE JOURNAL OF THE PALESTINE ORIENTAL SOCIETY (Vol. XIV, No. 4) contains a short memoir of the late Père Mallon, S.J., the well-known archæologist and Egyptologist. Dom Hugh Bévenot, O.S.B., writes learnedly on "The Armenian Text of Maccabees" and points to the value of the Armenian version, hitherto insufficiently recognized.

IN THE FEBRUARY HOME REVIEWS.

THE MONTH: Cardinal Bourne by Archbishop Goodier; Viennese Impressions by John Murray; How Malthus found a hearing by R. G. Cookson; Devotional Literature in Post-Reformation England by Herbert Thurston.

BLACKFRIARS: Catholicism and Protestantism in the Modern World by Oskar Bauhofer; After Four Hundred Years by Fr. Aelwin Lindal-Atkinson.

JOURNAL OF THEOLOGICAL STUDIES: Henry Julian White and the Vulgate by A. Souter. The Chronology of the Reign of Herod the Great by T. Corbishley, S.J.; The Study of Gnosticism by R. P. Casey; Cluniar Exemption by Rev. W. Williams.

PAX: The Altar, the Chief Figure of Christ by Geoffrey Webb.

J. M. T. B.

CORRESPONDENCE

MR. BELLOC AND FR. HUGHES.

Fr. Andrew Beck, A.A., writes :—

It seems to me that Mr. Belloc is unjustly hard on Fr. Hughes in what he says with regard to the origin of the Star Chamber. (See pp. 127-128 of last month's issue.) He suggests that his reviewer is talking nonsense, and this through ignorance. Yet he himself appears to know nothing about the remarkable articles on *Council, Star Chamber and Privy Council Under the Tudors* which Professor Pollard wrote more than a dozen years ago; and repeats the old story given by Prothero and Fisher in 1894 and 1906. I think that Pollard has proved that the Act of 1487 had little or nothing to do with the Star Chamber; and that "for at least half a century after that date it does not seem to have occurred to anyone to see any connection between 3 Henry VII, c. 1 and the star chamber." The Act seems to have been intended to deal with offenders in the Royal Household, or even in the Council itself, and its object, as Pollard says, was "to bring the more intimate offender before the more intimate tribunal." Apparently it was that doughty Catholic, Edmund Plowden, who started in Elizabeth's reign, the theory that the Star Chamber depended for its jurisdiction on the Act of 1487, and it was on this plea that the court was abolished in 1641—not the only case of a legal decision being based on false historical premises.

I think most historians now accept Pollard's conclusion—certainly the leading authority, Dr. E. R. Turner, does so—even though it does not clear up all the doubtful points; and it seems very unfair to accuse Fr. Hughes of ignorance because he holds the same view. Rather does it seem, as old Plowden himself might have said, that "The case is altered."

LATIN CONVERSATION.

The Rev. J. R. Meagher writes to us :—

To your growing bibliography please add: (1) *Colloquia Latina*, adapted from Erasmus, with notes and vocabulary by G. M. Edwards, M.A. Cambridge University Press, 1907. 1s. 6d. (2) *Altera Colloquia Latina*. Author, editor and price the same. Like most school-texts, these can easily be got second hand. They are hardly suitable for young students, however, as Erasmus even here does not conceal his antipathy to the religious orders. Still, his gibes are not very fierce, and most students encounter worse things in their ordinary literary studies. His various characters who carry on the conversations are very much alive and the dialogues sparkle with wit and satire of a mild kind.

PERMISSU SUPERIORUM.

en
r.
in
et
es
re
; M
7
at
n
o
-
d
e
y
t
t